

**Owain Llŷr ap Gareth**

**Welshing on Postcolonialism: Complicity and Resistance in the  
Construction of Welsh Identities**

Submitted to the Department of International Politics, University of Wales  
Aberystwyth

University of Wales Aberystwyth 2009

## **Summary**

The thesis places Wales within a postcolonial framework, and uses postcolonial theory to analyse the emergence of Welsh identities. Positioning ‘Wales’ and the ‘Welsh’ as subjects of study in relation to the British Empire suggests how discursive processes of power in Wales take place parallel to those in other areas of the Empire. In analysing these processes, the thesis illustrates the different effects of power in different local contexts. Welsh identities are shown as emerging and being produced by these discursive processes, and are found to be often resistant and complicit with dominant discourses in the same movement.

In the central chapters of the thesis, the emergence of Welsh identities is analysed with reference to particular discourses and events: education, ritual, literary criticism and popular culture. These are, in Chapter 1, the Blue Books controversy; in Chapter 2, the investiture of the Prince of Wales in 1911 and again in 1969; and, finally, in Chapter 3, the construction of different theories of literary criticism and the role of play and authenticity in Welsh popular culture.

Using the work of Michel Foucault, the thesis rejects the notion of an original and essential Welsh identity and takes power to be fluid and productive of subjects. Various articulations of Welsh identity appear as dynamic, hybrid and linked to particular discourses, allowing us to understand the emergence of such identities without reference to a pre-given Welsh identity.

## Contents

<b>Introduction: Welshing (on) Postcolonialism.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Michel Foucault: Discourse, Knowledge, Power.....	12
Postcolonialism.....	18
Nationalism and Postcolonialism.....	24
Postcolonial Theory in Wales.....	31
Research Questions and Structure.....	39
Back ‘Home’ to Beddgelert.....	43
<b>Chapter 1: Civilising Wales: Governmentality, Pastoral Power and the 1847</b>	
<b>Report on Education in Wales.....</b>	<b>45</b>
1. Education, Governmentality and Colonialism: Constructing the English and Anglicised Subjects.....	50
<i>The Subject of Education.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Colonial Discourse and Education in India.....</i>	<i>55</i>
2. The Impact in Wales: The 1847 Report.....	62
<i>The Report on the State of Education in Wales.....</i>	<i>64</i>
3. The Response in Wales and Welsh Pastoral Power.....	72
<i>Constructing Who Speaks For Wales.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>‘Useful’ and Religious Education: Moral Education and Socialisation.....</i>	<i>78</i>
<i>The Welsh Language and Moral Education.....</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>The Welsh Moral Subject in Education.....</i>	<i>84</i>
<i>Constructing Welsh womanhood and cultivating a civilised nation..</i>	<i>86</i>
Conclusion.....	92
<b>Chapter 2: Repeat Performances of the Princes’ Investitures Rituals 1911 and 1969.....</b>	<b>95</b>
1. Ritual, Representation and Society .....	100
2. The Investiture of the Prince of Wales (1911).....	108

The Development of Royal Pageantry .....	109
The Call for the Investiture .....	112
Rhoscomyl's Liturgy: Meaning-making and the Investiture .....	114
Empire, Difference and Unity .....	122
Sentiment and Romanticism in the Edwardian Period .....	126
3. The Investiture of the Prince of Wales as Re-run: the 1969 Investiture and its postcolonial reading .....	128
Conclusion .....	143
 <b>Chapter 3: Language, Nationality and Authenticity: Translation and Hybridity in Welsh Culture</b> .....	<b>147</b>
1. <i>From english to English</i> .....	152
<i>From Dissenting Academies to 'Cramming' and 'chatter about Shelley'</i> .....	154
<i>Tirades of Taste and Teutonism (Cambridge 1885-1918)</i> .....	155
<i>A National Keystone Subject: English for the English</i> .....	158
2. A Resistant Welsh National Narrative: Saunders Lewis's Criticism .....	159
<i>Educational Developments in Welsh from the 1890s</i> .....	164
<i>Saunders Lewis and Euro-Welsh Civilisation: Organic Community and National Aesthetic History</i> .....	166
<i>Social Sin and Psychology: the need for organic community</i> .....	171
<i>Cultural Authority and Speaking For Wales</i> .....	173
3. Quandaries of Welshness: The Construction of 'Anglo-Welsh' Tradition .....	179
<i>Questioning Anglo-Welsh Literature</i> .....	180
<i>Constructing Anglo-Welsh Tradition</i> .....	182
<i>Competing Authenticities: Traditions of 'modernity' and 'anti-modernity' and the In-Between</i> .....	186
4. What's Welsh for Zen? Contestation, Hybridity and Translation in Welsh Popular music since the 1960s .....	191

<i>John Cale: Exile and Return</i> .....	194
<i>Pop, Protest and Authenticity</i> .....	196
<i>The Politics of Translation and Bilingualism in Welsh Pop</i> .....	202
Conclusion.....	213
<b>Conclusion: Where Was Wales? The Location of the Welsh Subject and Welsh Culture</b> .....	<b>216</b>
Wales, Nation and Postcolonialism.....	217
Summary of the Thesis.....	225
Problems, Problematisations and Contribution.....	228
Return to the Welsh Subject.....	233
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>238</b>

## Introduction: Welshing (on) Postcolonialism

*Welsh (v) – ‘Welsh on’, to dishonour a deal (debt or obligation).*  
- Oxford English Dictionary

Once upon a time, there was a brave Welsh Prince, Llywelyn the Great, who often visited Snowdonia with his family to hunt and partake in such sports thought excellent pastimes in olden times.<sup>1</sup> The Prince had an affectionate dog, Gelert, which would lead every chase. One day, when they had gone out to hunt, Gelert could not be found among the hunting dogs. When Llewelyn arrived home, Gelert ran to meet him, his fur crimsoned in blood from head to tail. Llywelyn ran for the nursery; but alas! The place was covered in blood and the cot upside down, with no sign of the child. Infuriated, Llywelyn seized his sword and slay poor Gelert, who yelped loudly as he died. The dying yelp awoke the child, found whole and hale under the covers beside the cradle. Beneath the blankets was found a huge, ravenous-looking wolf, terrible to behold even as a lifeless carcass. The poor dog was now dead, and the Prince was mourning in a flood of tears Gelert, this epitome of faithfulness he had so rashly slain. He commanded that the dog was to be buried with honour in a spot near by, and a large stone be placed on his grave to mark his resting-place. The stone remains to this day, and gives the name to the village where Gelert lies: Beddgelert (‘Gelert’s Grave’).

Beddgelert is my home village. Rather than revel in the glory of being brought up in the shadow of this illustrious pre-medieval dog, I feel sadly compelled to divulge to the reader that this story is not true. I am afraid this may be somewhat upsetting to the reader. However, in the name of scholarly precision, it is our duty to get away from viewing this story as explaining the name ‘Beddgelert’ to get at what is of real interest. It may be of some solace to the reader that the interesting part of the story requires us to change the question from whether or not this cock-and-bull story is true or not.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following rendering of the story is based on the version found in D E Jenkins, *Beddgelert; its Facts Fairies and Folk-lore* (Llewelyn Jenkins: 1899), p 59-60

The Welsh Prince Llywelyn the Great did exist, but beyond that fact we learn little about him from this story. It is possible that there was a Gelert who gives the village and parish its name, but this ‘Ciliart’ was possibly an eighth century saint, an Irish chief, or a group of monk settlers, but was certainly not a dog.<sup>2</sup> In his myth-debunking work *Beddgelert: its Facts, Fairies and Folklore*, introduced by renowned Welsh philologist Sir John Rhys, D E Jenkins describes two men in the year 1802 struggling to carry a large stone to be the grave for the dog Gelert.<sup>3</sup> It appears that they ‘tried to raise up a large stone which lay on the northern side of the hillock, but that they failed; and they carried the present stone from another place in order to put it where it now is.’<sup>4</sup> One of these men, David Pritchard, the first landlord of the newly built Royal Goat Hotel in Beddgelert, would then commission a professional poet to write the story of Gelert in poetic form in English and Welsh, and what would become the founding tourist myth of Beddgelert.<sup>5</sup> This myth of Gelert was a work of marketing genius, and remains a salient kitsch tourist magnet to this day.

However, it was a myth that emerged in a particular position. The nearby harbour town of Porthmadog had been constructed by retaining land from the sea via the embankment (the ‘Cob’) constructed by William Madocks. Madocks bought the land in 1798 and the first embankment begun in 1800, although it would not finish until 1811.<sup>6</sup> The Act of Union with Ireland in 1800 made the prospect of traffic more likely, and Madocks depended on Porth Dinllaen being chosen as the main sea link and packing station between Ireland and London for his planned railway to be viable, but this was in fact given to Holyhead in 1810.<sup>7</sup> The myth of Gelert is thus linked to material developments, of workers housed in nearby Tremadog (‘Madock’s Town’), and also the prospect of increased travel and tourism through the area due to the incorporation of Ireland. Moreover, during the Napoleonic Wars, the British upper classes could no longer easily travel to the Continent, and so the peripheries of Britain

---

<sup>2</sup> *ibid*, p 23, 26; It is possible that it was corrupted from Bedd Ciliart (Ciliart’s Grave) Bwth Cilvach y Garth (Hut in the Recess of the Hill) or Bwth Celei (‘Hut of the Culdees’) (Jenkins, *Beddgelert*, p 22-27); on Sir John Rhys and his influence, see Thomas Parry, *Hanes Llenyddiaeth hyd 1900* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1953), p 279-81

<sup>3</sup> Jenkins, *Beddgelert*, p 57-9

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p 69

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, p 68-9

<sup>6</sup> Sir A Skempton and M Chrimes, *A Biographical Dictionary of Civil Engineers in Great Britain and Ireland: 1500 to 1830* (Telford: 2002), p429-31; E Beazley, *Madocks and the Wonder of Wales* (Faber & Faber: 1967)

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*

became a pull for upper-class tourism.<sup>8</sup> The myth of Gelert would appeal to this constituency due to the new assignation of rugged wild spaces such as Snowdonia as picturesque and ‘Romantic’. Indeed, celebrated English romantic poets were regular guests in the parish.<sup>9</sup>

A probable source of the story is Sanskrit, with the dog, wolf and Prince taking the place of a mongoose, serpent and a Brahmin.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, a probable reading of this story is as an example of colonial literary appropriation, taking advantage of the wide array of stories emanating from Orientalist scholarship that would have been popularised with their importation from India over the course of the final decades of the eighteenth century. This story can be read as the result of British colonial presence and learning in India.

This particularly local example therefore illustrates a position in relation to global Empire and economy in the early nineteenth century, and one that is unstable. The story feeds on Romantic stereotypical myths of Celticism and Welshness, and uses as its source such ideas seen in Indian literature as collected and translated by British Orientalists. This colonial appropriation is therefore an uncertain one of translation, travel and tourism, in that it involves the incorporation of exoticism and imperial learning into a particular localised position of a peripheral position nevertheless at the centre of Empire. Is this to be read as a ‘British’ appropriation of colonial literature, or a ‘Welsh’ one used to attract English tourists via a stereotypical view of Celticism in the rash and impulsive Prince? Or is it to be read as both of these?

In illustrating such links in this most remote of localities the problematic of postcolonialism emerges. It indicates how cultural space is relational and how identities of place, people, even mythic dead dogs, emerge in links between several parallel developments and processes. These are both material and economic, and literary and cultural. Such emerging identities have to be *read* in order to allow us to open up places to critical analysis in order to make such links with such processes of power and knowledge in even a banal myth in a place as remote as Beddgelert.

---

<sup>8</sup> J Urry, *Consuming Places* (Routledge: 1995), p 193-210

<sup>9</sup> *Gwyddoniadur Cymreig* (Academi: 2007), p 741

<sup>10</sup> Jenkins, *Beddgelert*, p 60-1; S Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages* (1867, Kessinger: 1998), p 132-43



The same goes for Wales and Welsh identity. Raymond Williams indicates the way we can read even ‘small’ places as relative to our particular position and can be opened up to many possible readings, once denaturalised:

We learn to see by distinguishing shapes, and this is as true of a culture as of the physical world. What we see and hear every day is part of our culture, but just as important are the invisible, intangible shapes we carry and bring to bear. Thus we see Wales as a small country, but even standing on the Brecon Beacons...it is not smallness we see; it is land and distance, familiarity and strangeness. We are, we say, a small people, but in immediate human terms what is small, what is knowable, about twenty-five hundred thousand people: more than we can ever talk to or know? Smallness, then, is a shape we are carrying...It is necessary to learn some shapes of this kind, yet we should never, by habit, suppose them to be natural.<sup>11</sup>

By denaturalising such identities and places (or ‘shapes’ as Raymond Williams puts them), we are able to view them differently, and open them up to critical analysis.

It is the starting point of this thesis that identities and places are *made*, and moreover made in relation to other places and identities, but not, as Marx famously said in another context, in circumstances of people’s own choosing.<sup>12</sup> In analysing these relations, this thesis aims to understand the emergence of different particular Welsh identities at particular times in relation to discourses and events. As such, this thesis also looks at those authorized to speak ‘about Wales’ and ‘for Wales’. Such authority to speak does not merely reflect ‘a people’ who are ‘there’, but also rhetorically aims to construct that people’s identity. So for example, to speak of a ‘pure Wales’, is not only to assert that Wales’s people are pure, but also an attempt to make it so, to project into a wished future; similarly, to speak of a ‘civic Wales’ attempts to reflect ‘the Welsh people’, but also at the same time attempts to rhetorically make a people in that image. This cultural authority carries rhetorical force; it performs identity, and does so in response to particular circumstances at particular times.

---

<sup>11</sup> R Williams, ‘The Arts in Wales’ in D G Williams (ed), *Who Speaks for Wales? Nation, Culture, Identity* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff: 2003), p12

<sup>12</sup> K Marx, ‘The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte’ in D McLellan *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (Oxford University Press: 2000), p 329

It is for this reason that this thesis uses Postcolonial theory, but also work that was highly influential on that theory, that of Michel Foucault. Postcolonial theory views every culture as hybrid, and that there is no possibility of an identity that is self-complete, whole, and strictly demarcated from other identities. Asserting the hybridity of cultures and subjects is important in order to understand how processes of identification work. It also indicates an avenue to critically analyse the cultural basis of authority of speaking for a nation, and defining its historical narrative, its cultural traits, and its wants. If one takes a culture as hybrid, to assert authority in speaking for, or writing the nation, is to assert an ambivalent authority on shifting ground.

Given that developments in Wales parallel others elsewhere, and that discourses travel and are translated into the Welsh context, this allows us to look at culture, and power, as dynamic, shifting and coming from several different points in a network of power relations. In looking at particular discourses and events, this thesis aims to avoid a view of power as repressive – as an obstacle to allowing people to become what they are – but rather as productive of subjects and of resistance. In this way it opens to social analysis without the state as an oppressive ‘thing’ in itself, or of ideology as false and hiding the real ‘truth’, as this leads to reductive arguments and view of power as repressive that is too simplistic. It aims rather at analysing power in a more fluid way, using the work of Michel Foucault. In this theoretical framework, those who spoke and wrote about Wales were indicating power relations at a particular point, rather than asserting an essential Welshness that had been suppressed. Some viewpoints came to be hegemonic and institutionalised as part of a selective tradition of Welshness.

In analysing Welsh identity in this way my aim is twofold. Firstly there is a personal element to this project, in the push and pull of my own identity; as Foucault puts it ‘the insistence on identity and the injunction to make a break both feel like impositions, and in the same way’.<sup>13</sup> In terms of this question of identity as something to be ‘true’ to, and to be broken, it is clear that we need to think of identity as dynamic and relational (where are ‘we’, in relation to whom), and linked to narratives (when were ‘we’, who are ‘we’ today). In indicating this flux one has to be careful not

---

<sup>13</sup> M Foucault, ‘For an Ethic of Discomfort’ in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, vol 3: *Power* (Penguin: 1994), p 444

to speak from a fixed position of identity – the question of the ‘we’ is always ambivalent, to be problematised. As Foucault notes in response to the ‘liberal ironist’ Richard Rorty:

Richard Rorty points out that in these analysis I do not appeal to any “we” – to any of those “wes” whose consensus, whose values, whose traditions constitute the framework of thought and define the conditions in which it is validated. But the problem is, precisely, to decide if it is actually suitable to place oneself within a “we” in order to assert the principles and the values one accepts; or if it is not, rather, necessary to make the future formation of a “we” possible by elaborating the question. Because it seems to me that the “we” must not be previous to the question; it can only be the result – and the necessarily temporary result – of the question as it is posed in the new terms in which one formulates it.<sup>14</sup>

This questions aims at problematising Welsh identity through the discursive analysis of specific events. The work does not seek to find a prescriptive political solution; rather the aim is to analyse how spaces have been opened for subversion, how identities are deconstructed and reconstructed, and on what terms and in what relation to the wider discursive field that occurs, and this with particular reference to Welsh identity. The authoritative positions (and so positions of discursive power) where Wales is ‘spoken from’ are what this thesis analyses.

In questioning this consensual ‘we’ from which to speak, the aim is to outline the spaces in which resistant discourses may be constructed from the particular to the universal and their limits. From these spaces of the inbetween and marginal, it may be possible to seek resonances, parallels and echoes in wider global spaces. In utilising postcolonial and Foucauldian theory the aim is not an analysis of the local, the particular in itself (as Homi Bhabha notes, that would be ‘a profoundly parochial enterprise’), but rather to relate how the particular is constructed in relation to a construction of universality, to look at the relation between the local and the global and the global in the local in a different way.<sup>15</sup> A solution to the problems of complicity and resistance within discourses as such is beyond this thesis’s limits, and its theoretical framework would see such a prescription would be artificial anyway.

---

<sup>14</sup> M Foucault, ‘Polemics, Politics and Problematisations’ in P Rabinow (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994), p 114-5; on Rorty see his classic work *Contingency, Irony, Solidarity* (Cambridge University Press: 1989)

<sup>15</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994)

Hopefully the analysis will at least have some bearing on the question of constructing a ‘universal discourse, constructed out of, not against, the proliferation of particularisms,’ and this by undertaking to indicate how the particular and universal relate within the resistances and complicities of events analysed in this thesis.<sup>16</sup> I would contend that the role of questioning and problematising identities as given subject positions which can be opposed to a ‘centre’ of power is an important rejoinder to an easy view of Welsh identity on those terms.

As is already clear, Foucault’s work is important to this thesis. I have found in his work on power and discourse, and of knowledge and truth, a particular toolbox for analysing how particular articulations of Welsh identities emerge in particular circumstances. The following section introduces Michel Foucault’s main concepts, before linking them to postcolonial theory, and some key texts in the literature of nationalism to which a postcolonial theoretical framework on the Welsh nation must relate itself. Following this I shall outline the postcolonial literature in Wales, and where this work relates to that nascent literature. Finally I shall outline the structure of the thesis and its aims.

### ***Michel Foucault: Discourse, Knowledge, Power***

In the unlikely event of somebody finding a lost text of Foucault’s dealing with the story of Beddgelert, I am inclined to believe that he would approach it in a similar way to my analysis above. He would attempt to chart its emergence and its truth-effects by linking it to the myriad discourses and relations in which it emerges. The actual origin of the name ‘Beddgelert’ would largely be of little consequence, as all identity must be fabricated and linked to other ‘alien’ discourses. The veracity of the story would also be of little consequence: what would matter would be what the story does within a wider discourse of tourism, Orientalism and technological development, and what power relations it reveals in its emergence and its claims to truth, and what its material effects would be. The key thread running through Foucault’s works is an

---

<sup>16</sup> E Laclau, ‘Constructing Universality’ in J Butler, E Laclau and S Zizek *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000), p 306

analysis of power, and it is his linking of power relations and knowledge that is key in his work. This overview will look at Foucault's particular theory of power and its link with his other concepts of discourse and knowledge, and subjectivity and resistance; and how they relate to my thesis.

Of course, one would surmise that the story of Gelert would hold little interest for Foucault. Thus far at least, no one has attempted to use the 'truth' of this dead dog as a means of authority in political and social power relations, which is what his theory of discourse analyses. Discourse in Foucault's work is not everyday speech, but a way of analysing authority, claims to 'truth', and their effects. As Dreyfus and Rabinow argue, Foucault's interest is in speech acts which are given authority, or which have authority placed upon them.<sup>17</sup> Foucault is less interested in understanding the rules of understanding speech acts than what gives them authority, validation and what position of expertise they are spoken from – in other words how their meaning is produced and proliferated from such procedures.<sup>18</sup> Discourse and power speaks through subjects in these authorised positions, rather than the other way around. In other words, Foucault is interested in how those who speak are linked to networks of knowledge and power, rather than their being authors of their own speech, which would involve asking 'what does s/he mean, or mean to mean', a question of little relevance to Foucault.

There is no given meaning, depth or direct presence to these statements to be uncovered, but rather they are to be analysed in relation to their truth-effects, that is, in what they *do*. Claims to 'truth' have a material effect, and it is this material aspect that is examined further in his work on power. It is in relation to this construction of discursive fields via such statements that Foucault can say later that things 'have no essence or that their essence was fabricated through piecemeal forms'.<sup>19</sup> They can persevere, be transformed or wholly destroyed by discursive shifts, rather than any inherent truths they 'hold'. This anti-essentialism carries also to his own work in what

---

<sup>17</sup> H L Dreyfus and P Rabinow, *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Harvester: 1982), 45-9

<sup>18</sup> Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Routledge: 2002), p 120; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, p 45-9: Dreyfus and Rabinow here give the example of the statement 'It is going to rain' as an everyday act of little significance, but is an authoritative statement when spoken by a spokesman of the National Weather Services due to general meteorological theory.

<sup>19</sup> M Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', in *Essential Works of Foucault vol 2: Aesthetics* (Penguin: 1994) p 371

he analyses – in the following quotation he is describing a ‘history of madness’ rather than of the ‘mad’, as his theory does not allow us to find the depth of what it is ‘to be mad’:

We are not trying to find out who was mad at a particular period, or in what his madness consisted, or whether his disorders were identical with those known to us today... We are not trying to reconstitute what madness might be... Such a history of the referent is no doubt possible... But what we are concerned with here is not to neutralise discourse, to make it the sign of something else, and to pierce through its density in order to reach what remains silently anterior to it... we wish to dispense with ‘things’. To ‘depresentify’ them... To substitute for the enigmatic treasure of ‘things’ anterior to discourse, the regular formation of objects that emerge only in discourse.<sup>20</sup>

Similarly, his history of the ‘birth of the prison’, *Discipline and Punish*, is not about ‘the prison’ or ‘penal reform’ as such, but about how the penal institution emerges from within discourses of human sciences, power and knowledge.<sup>21</sup>

In this thesis I am charting the construction of ‘Welsh identity’ in particular positions, rather than attempting to uncover ‘the Welsh’, or ‘Wales’ as such. It is not an attempt to find the depth of what is really ‘underneath’ that identity, and is not about finding the essence of what people (authors) really think, or have thought, or should think. For Foucault it is at once simpler and more complicated than this – it is to see how people can come to say what they can say, and from the particular spaces from which they speak discourse. It is a rejection of an analysis which sees knowledge as cumulative in the human sciences, and is rather an analysis of the contingent factors which allow some discourses to become prevalent. It is thus a rejection of teleological views of history and identities in favour of a view that looks to contingency, dispersal and discontinuity. In this way one can analyse ‘Welsh identity’ as dynamic and with possibilities for subversion and reconstruction, and chart the emergence of different articulations of Welsh identity at different times.

It is in his 1971 essay ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’ that Foucault outlines the genealogical historical method, which he develops in his works on disciplinary power,

---

<sup>20</sup> Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p 52-3

<sup>21</sup> M Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Penguin: 1991)

*Discipline and Punish* and *History of Sexuality: Vol I*.<sup>22</sup> Using Nietzsche, Foucault constructs his method in opposition to traditional history as a search for origins, which he sees as Platonic metaphysics. These ideals are above and outside the material world, and thus is a historical framework that implicitly assume non-historical essences, which Foucault's genealogical method opposes:

because it is an attempt to capture the exact essence of things, their purest possibilities, and their carefully protected identities; because this search assumes the existence of immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession. This search is directed to "that which was already there," the "very same" of an image of a primordial truth fully adequate to its nature, and it necessitates the removal of every mask to ultimately disclose an original identity...[there is] not a timeless and essential secret but the secret that they have no essence, or that their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms.<sup>23</sup>

By contrast, Foucault seeks to understand the emergence of these fabricated forms of identity:

A genealogy of values, morality, asceticism and knowledge will never confuse itself with a search for "origins"...On the contrary, it will cultivate the details and accidents that accompany every beginning; it will be scrupulously attentive to their petty malice; it will await their emergence, once unmasked, in the face of the other.<sup>24</sup>

Emergence of such identities arises from a 'hazardous play of dominations', as such 'no one is responsible for an emergence; no one can glory in it, since it always occurs in the interstices'.<sup>25</sup> This emergence of identities, fabricated and hybrid is studied further in the work of Homi K Bhabha in the next section on Postcolonialism. I would qualify the statement that 'no one can glorify' in emergences by indicating that claiming that 'glory' is a claim of authority to speak that identity. Interpretation of such mythic histories of identity is an important part of this thesis, and we shall return to it with an overview of theories of history and narration, in particular the work of Walter Benjamin.

---

<sup>22</sup> Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy. History', p 369-392

<sup>23</sup> Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', p 371

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*, p 373

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*, 376, 377

Foucault's decentring of the subject also means that genealogical history does not depend on the "rediscovery of ourselves", an attempt that simply projects into the past our present for 'our' being.<sup>26</sup> Inextricably linked to this concept of genealogy is the exposure of power relations. For Foucault, there can be 'no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor a field of knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations'.<sup>27</sup> However, power in the Foucauldian sense, like discourse, is not something held by anyone or any thing in particular (such as 'the state'), and so is not *merely* oppressive, but also *productive* of its subjects. As Foucault puts it in his *History of Sexuality*: 'Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of inegalitarian and mobile relations.'<sup>28</sup>

As a result there is 'no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations'.<sup>29</sup> Power must therefore be analysed and understood from the bottom-up, from the specific nodes where power is invested. For example, to state that one is analysing capitalism is one thing, but to analyse from a presupposed definition of capitalism and analysing everything from this macro-level 'thing' is highly problematic, and dismisses too many power relations as irrelevant. In order to understand capitalism it would be necessary to understand how capital works in the ebbs and flows at the capillaries of society, and how it is productive of different relations and identities in relation with other forces (sexuality and gender, nation, race, language and so on) rather than merely see everything as a reflection of the economic base.

As such, 'relations of power are not in superstructural positions, with merely a role of prohibition or accompaniment; they have a direct productive role, wherever they come into play'.<sup>30</sup> Power works in dynamic vectors throughout society, shaping its subjects and being articulated together in particular 'nodal points' in the network of societal relations. It is important to note that these discourses are constructed (and

---

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*, p 380

<sup>27</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p 27

<sup>28</sup> M Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol 1: The Will to Truth* (Penguin: 1998), p 94

<sup>29</sup> *ibid*

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*



indeed must be re-constructed constantly), and that there is nothing pre-determined or essential in their content as such (although in each discursive fields there are clear limits in what can be said, given that 'relations of power are not in a position of exteriority'). It is in this sense that discourse is linked to power and 'produced piecemeal from alien forms.'

If power and knowledge produce subjects in this way, and is not a repressive obstacle to becoming what one 'really is', it has significance for our view of resistance. As Foucault states:

Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power. Should it be said that one is always "inside" power, there is no "escaping" it, there is no absolute outside where it is concerned, because one is subject to the law in any case? Or that, history, being the ruse of reason, power is the ruse of history, always emerging the winner? This would be to misunderstand the strictly relational character of power relationships. Their existence depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations. These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network. Hence there is no single locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary. Instead there is a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case...by definition, they can only exist in the strategic field of power relations. But this does not mean that they are only a reaction or rebound, forming with respect to the basic domination an underside that is in the end always passive, doomed to perpetual defeat...[because] they too are distributed in an irregular fashion: the points, knots, or focuses of resistance are spread over time and space at varying densities.<sup>31</sup>

Resistance is therefore caught in the same webs of discourses, technologies of power and history as the dominant discourses, which indicates how there cannot be a speaking from a point of authority which cannot in turn be subverted; but also that there is no absolute point of 'truth' from which to oppose that authority. Foucault's analysis allows us to view where there are spaces for subversion, but ones that are complicit, immanently produced within, and part of those power/knowledge relations, rather than a transcendent position of emancipation.

The thesis will analyse the role of cultural interlocutors in Wales construct a resistant culture by resisting authority, but also at the same time constructing their own cultural

---

<sup>31</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality: Vol 1*, p 95-6

authority and moral norms and values, translating them into a local context from wider discourses. Foucault's work allows me to study interpretations of Wales which are not implicitly questions of depth such as 'What is Wales?' or 'who are the Welsh?', where one is tacitly accepting, or searching for and at the same time constructing, an essence, even if one acknowledges it escapes our grasp. It also means that my view of interpretations of Wales is not simply to ask what an author meant (or meant to say, or failed to say), a question which again attempts a hermeneutic approach of interpreting an intention of somebody from that subject's own horizon of interpretation (which tells us little).

Rather the questions may be termed as: 'how do ideas of Wales and the Welsh emerge in particular situations?'; 'What different discourses/discursive formations intersect within discussions of "Wales" or "the Welsh"?'; 'what contestations arise in attempting to take up the discourses of "Wales" and "the Welsh"?'. It also does not simply close off games of power as 'oppressive', top-down, or ideological (that is a camera obscura that distorts the real 'truth' underneath) and so allows us to view power in Welsh culture as relational, rather than merely oppositional or as a repressed essence. Welsh positions are already within - and complicit with as well as possibly resistant to - dominant discourses in this sense. As we shall see in the following section, such questions on Wales are also a useful contribution to postcolonial theory.

## ***Postcolonialism***

A key text for postcolonial studies is Edward W Said's *Orientalism*. Said took, along with Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony and Raymond Williams's analysis of literary texts, Michel Foucault's work as his major influence.<sup>32</sup> The aim of Said's work is to analyse the discourses which have been constructed under Western scholarship around the idea of the 'Orient' as a tool of colonialism. Authoritative texts, produced in all kinds of academic disciplines from philology to geography, history to literature, provided a support to European penetration of other lands, by its representations of non-European others:

---

<sup>32</sup> E W Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (Penguin: 1995), p 14

A text purporting to contain knowledge about something actual...is not easily dismissed. Expertise is attributed to it. The authority of academics, institutions and governments can accrue to it...such texts can *create* not only knowledge but the very reality they describe.<sup>33</sup>

Thus, Said maps out a terrain of how discourses have circulated around the Orient and have been complicit with imperialism in the relation of power and knowledge. The study of the Orient cannot be innocent because knowledge of it was produced in the West and in a colonial power relation. It was thus also a production of the West's self image attributed onto the Orient difference and barbarity: it 'was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted a binary opposition between the familiar (Europe, the West, "us") and the strange (the Orient, the East, "them")'.<sup>34</sup>

The importance of this turn in the study of what used to be 'third world studies' is that it allows for the movement from the economic and political (as narrowly thought) terrain to the study of culture and knowledge. In analysing the cultural products of the West, and its complicity with colonialism, Said does not merely analyse those products but the cultural discourses – the civilisation – that spawn them. As with Foucault's analysis of the construction of 'man' as an object to be studied, the West's construction of 'the Orient' indicates how colonialism was not some aberration, a detour from the enlightenment and humanism, but implicit within them. It was those tools of knowledge that allowed for the 'scientific' domination of the Orient as other. I would add also the disciplinary practices and cultural contestations that accompany them, a side of Foucault's thought that Said underplays. Indeed the subtitle to his work, 'Western conceptions of the West' is a tacit acknowledgement of the limits of his work. However, he allows spaces for these avenues to be pursued by others.

Nevertheless, this focus does lead to some problems in Said's work. Firstly it reasserts the binary opposition he wishes to subvert – 'The Orient' and 'the Occident', and this by bringing to the fore the idea of intentionality, of a western will to knowledge and domination, and thus an unitary and holistic identity and consciousness of 'the West'. Western discourse may not be as unitary, stable or as 'wilful' as this. As Dennis Porter notes, Said cannot conceive of counter-hegemonic forces within the west,

---

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*, p 94

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*, p 43

leading to the construction of two unitary and discrete blocs, and thus misses out on parallel power relations within ‘the West’.<sup>35</sup> This leads to the second problem of the framework being ahistorical – Said’s work ‘asserts the unified character of Western discourse on the Orient over some two millennia’<sup>36</sup> A focus on the particular peripheral site of Wales within ‘Europe’, and ‘Britain’, and its parallelism, differences and equivalences with other sites may help mitigate against these problems.<sup>37</sup>

Homi Bhabha indicates a passage he sees as underdeveloped in Said where he indicates the Western encounter with the uncanny:

What gives the immense number of encounters [between East and West] some unity...is the vacillation I spoke of earlier. Something patently foreign and distant acquires, for one reason or another, a status more rather than less familiar...a new *median category* emerges, a category that allows one to see new things, things seen for the first time, as versions of a previously known thing.<sup>38</sup>

Said sees this category as a discursive means of controlling what seems a threat to the order of things, by muting the threat of the other by relating it to the (Western) scientific archive of what is known. However, Bhabha asks what occurs around this ‘median category’. Bhabha’s departure point from Said is to view this median category as a ‘fetishism of stereotypes’. As Bhabha describes it:

It is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it...the scene of fetishism is also the scene of the reactivation of the primary fantasy – the subject’s desire for a pure origin that is always threatened by its division, for the subject must be gendered to be engendered, to be spoken.

---

<sup>35</sup> D Porter, ‘Orientalism and its Problems’ in P Williams & L Chrisman (eds) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory* (Longman: 1993), p 152

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*

<sup>37</sup> An interesting view of ‘the West’ in this context is given by A Mufti (‘Global Comparativism’ in *Critical Inquiry* (Winter 2005), p 46):

‘There is no stable and ultimately satisfying way of distinguishing Western from non-Western, European from non-European in this context, but, very broadly put, I would say that I mean by such designations those varied languages that, in the course of the invention of “Western” culture during the centuries of expansion and domination, have come to be *defined* as external to it. Primarily, of course, this means the languages whose historical origin are in the continental zones of Asia, Africa and the Americas...But we should not forget the experience of those language clusters in Eastern Europe and those “minor” languages in the Western countries that have themselves undergone similar processes of marginalisation and even decimation.’

<sup>38</sup> E W Said, p 58-9

The stereotype, then, as the primary point of subjectification in colonial discourse, for both the coloniser and colonised, is the scene of a similar fantasy and defence – the desire for originality which is again threatened by the differences of race, colour and culture.<sup>39</sup>

The significance of the stereotype is in accommodating the other and difference with reference to the self and similitude in a familiar frame of reference. The construction of ‘the passionate Celt’ as posited by Matthew Arnold, for example, is a means of mastery through knowledge of a type in opposition to one’s own (English) identity.<sup>40</sup> But it is also a means of mastery through knowledge in the apparatus of ‘Celtic Studies’, one that masters that category at the same time as constructing the ‘Celtic type’. Constructing ‘the Celt’ as different also legitimises rule by the rational Teutonic English. It constructs its own rational and universalised English identity in relation to the other (the Celt). The inauguration of a Chair of Celtic Studies was the institutionalisation of this discourse of knowledge and power from a ‘scientific’ (assumed as neutral in identity, and spoken from a non-place) perspective.<sup>41</sup> It also allows for the mummification of that category, it ‘fixes’ it, but also to allow its position in the modern world as being suitable only to antiquarian study.

However, this stereotype of ‘the Celt’ may be adopted by the other as self-affirmation, celebrating precisely those ‘femininised’ traits of artistry, romance and passion denigrated by this knowledge apparatus. This has significant political effects in allowing a space to ‘speak for’ the Celt, but this is also an ambiguous authority based on that ambivalence of striving for a mythic origin constructed by that master discourse.<sup>42</sup> Bhabha reads this process of reasserting a ‘real’ identity implicit in Said’s work of a ‘real’ Orient (or a ‘real Celtic-ness’) differently, rather than constructing what Foucault calls a ‘history of the referent’:

---

<sup>39</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 75

<sup>40</sup> M Arnold, *On the Study of Celtic Literature* (Smithe, Elder & Co: 1867)

<sup>41</sup> R J C Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (Routledge: 1994), p 71

<sup>42</sup> David Lloyd has illustrated in Ireland how the attempt to inscribe a ‘minority’ status on a national majority was also to lead to a romanticised monolithic view of what Irish culture should be – that is ‘pre-colonial’. He points out that no Irish folk or street songs could be understood without reference to the British influence in Ireland, and indeed, the forms of romantic nationalism in Ireland depended on the forms imported from the British canon. This is clearly an indication of Ireland’s hybrid status, and on the dangers of mummification of culture that an essential nation-ness may create. (D Lloyd, *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-colonial Moment* (Duke Press: 1993))

The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is a simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference (which the negation through the Other permits), constitutes a problem for the *representation* of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations<sup>43</sup>

This leads us to Bhabha's important use of the concept of hybridity. This indicates how identities are all constructed in the interstices between cultures (hence the title of his book *The Location of Culture*). As he states, citing Heidegger, 'the boundary becomes the place from which *something begins its presencing*'.<sup>44</sup> It is from these positions where identities (re)emerge, rather like Foucault's prisons emerging in the interstices between divergent discourses over man, individual and punishment overlapping at a particular point. This view of hybridity involves the repudiation of any basis of pure authenticity for any culture.<sup>45</sup>

Bhabha turns to the nation to explain this, noting that the 'very concepts of homogeneous national cultures...are in a profound process of redefinition'.<sup>46</sup> In this sense he looks at how nationhood is linked with internationalism (not particularly new in Wales), but that the space from 'the specific to the general' is not a smooth passage, but is 'a process of displacement and disjunction that does not totalise experience.'<sup>47</sup> As he elaborates:

Increasingly, 'national' cultures are being produced from the perspective of disenfranchised minorities. The most significant effect of this process is not the proliferation of 'alternative histories of the excluded' producing, as some would have it, a pluralist anarchy...The currency of critical comparativism, or aesthetic judgement, is no longer the national culture conceived as Benedict Anderson proposes as an 'imagined community' rooted in an 'homogeneous empty time' of progress and modernity.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p 75

<sup>44</sup> *ibid*, p 5

<sup>45</sup> Kirsti Bohata has pointed to the false impression the term hybridity gives of a biologicistic mixing of two previously fixed 'parent' cultures – 'synergy', she states would be a better description, 'as it emphasises the productive qualities of complex and multiple forces (rather than the two essential strands which are implied through the biological reproductive elements of hybridity)'. I agree. However, I have kept to the term 'hybridity' in its strict postcolonial usage, as it is the term that is in most current usage. (K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited: Writing Wales in English* (Cardiff: 2004), p 130)

<sup>46</sup> H K Bhabha, *the Location of Culture*, p 5

<sup>47</sup> *ibid*

<sup>48</sup> *ibid*, p 5-6

We shall return to Benedict Anderson in the next section. The warning of this passage against celebrating ‘alternative histories of the excluded’ is to caution against a romantic view of liberated subject positions of disenfranchised minorities that are in themselves rooted and more authentic than those at the ‘centre’. It is important to note that these may also involve a recentring and repetition, but may also appeal to an origin every bit as mythic as the ‘centre’. However that one is suspicious that all is not ‘new’ does not mean that we should not see this process of realignment as involving spaces for empowerment. This is also seen in his view on postcolonial theory:

If the jargon of our times – postmodernity, postcoloniality, postfeminism – has any meaning at all, it does not lie in the popular use of the ‘post’ to indicate sequentiality – *after* feminism; or polarity – *anti*-modernism....if the interest in postmodernism is limited to a celebration of the fragmentation of the ‘grand narratives’ of postenlightenment rationalism then, for all its intellectual excitement, it remains a profoundly parochial enterprise.<sup>49</sup>

This is an answer to the accusation that postcolonialism (and the other ‘posts’ mentioned) is merely about the local. The accusation of parochialism tends to be done by a speaker who assumes his or her own position to be (more) universal, but postcolonial theory sees such a construction of universality as particular, it is just that the particularity of that construction is forgotten. It is in this way that accusations of parochialism can be done in opposition to worldliness and internationalism, and is often retained in such accusations as ‘nationalist’.<sup>50</sup>

In fact, like the other ‘posts’ referred to by Bhabha, postcolonial theory need not merely celebrate the local in itself as if cordoned off from global processes. As Stuart Hall puts it:

some post-modern critics *may* believe that the global has fragmented into the local but most of the serious ones argue that what is happening is a mutual reorganisation of the local and the global, a very different proposition<sup>51</sup>

Analysis of cultural contestation serves to underline the instabilities at the heart of authorised statement – it can be subverted, and not merely through reference to local

---

<sup>49</sup> *ibid*, p 4

<sup>50</sup> Examples of this in the contemporary British and Welsh context are given in R Wyn Jones, *Rhoi Cymru’n Gyntaf; Syniadaeth Plaid Cymru* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2007), p 20, 24

<sup>51</sup> S Hall, ‘When was the Postcolonial: Thinking the Limit’ from I Cahmbers & L Curti *The Post-Colonial Question* (Routledge: 1996), p 257

struggles, but to the global processes that underline them. The centre and universal statements lacks *author*-ity, as it cannot have a unitary and universal meaning but can be read differently in particular situations, and so contested and subverted. As Fanon puts it on symbols of control:

The symbols of social order – the police, the bugle-calls in the barracks, military parades and the waving flags – are at one and the same time inhibitory and stimulating: for they do not convey the message ‘Don’t dare to budge’; rather, they cry out ‘Get ready to attack’<sup>52</sup>

Or, as Yeats famously put it in his poem ‘The Second Coming’: ‘the centre cannot hold/Things fall apart’.<sup>53</sup> But this also means that any concept of resistance and identification must be hybrid and ambivalent, and is constructed in particular situations by particular power relations. It is necessary to link this with the theoretical literature on nationalism, before analysing postcolonialism in Wales.

#### Nationalism and Postcolonialism

While this thesis does not present a theory of nationalism, in looking at Welsh identity it is clear that there are overlaps and convergences with the literature on nationalism, and it clearly informs the thesis as a whole. However the focus here is to use key texts in the literature of nationalism as a springboard to discuss postcolonial theory and national identity, to place it within my theoretical framework. This discussion sets out how I shall analyse national identity as articulated in specific instances, rather than present a general theory of nationalism, which is not what this thesis sets out to do.

If one were to look for a theoretical paradigm on nationalism, one could begin with Ernest Gellner. Gellner’s work is important as he introduces the idea that the nation is not a substantial concept, in that it does not have an essence, a ‘true’ origin. For Gellner, the nation is constructed and a modern phenomenon, rather than something to which peoples’ allegiances have naturally been drawn to from time immemorial. Rather, it is brought into being by industrialism, and the creation of socially mobile

---

<sup>52</sup> F Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Penguin: 1990), p 41

<sup>53</sup> W B Yeats, ‘The Second Coming’ in *Selected Poems* (Penguin Modern Classes: 2000), p 124



and literate masses, which can be made through education to share the same ‘high culture’:

Nationalism is not the awakening of an old, latent, dormant force, though that is indeed how it presents itself. It is in reality the consequence of a new of social organisation, based on deeply internalised, education-dependent high cultures, each protected by its own state.<sup>54</sup>

There are some convergences between Foucault’s discursive approach and Gellner’s view of the emergence of the nation. They both indicate the importance of the state at the institutional levels such as education (for Gellner, it is monopoly over education, rather than violence, which is key to the modern state);<sup>55</sup> that ideology is not the driving force at any intentional level, for Gellner nationalists ‘know not what they do’; and that the subject follows from the discourse, is constructed by it – ‘it is nationalism which engenders nations and not the other way around.’<sup>56</sup>

A problem with Gellner’s view of the nation as invented is that he sometimes uses this as a stick with which to beat nationalism as such:

the drawback to this formulation...is that Gellner is so anxious to show that nationalism masquerades under false pretences that he assimilates ‘invention’ to ‘fabrication’, rather than to ‘imagining’ and ‘creation’. In this way he implies that ‘true’ communities do exist which can be advantageously juxtaposed to nations.<sup>57</sup>

Indeed, such a negative view of nationalism pervades much of the theoretical literature. Eric Hobsbawm is undoubtedly amongst the most hostile, essentially seeing that this construction ‘tends to be negative’, and ‘constructed essentially from above’.<sup>58</sup> Indeed, his work singles out Welsh nationalism in particular, stating the clear falsehood that ‘Welsh language enthusiasts...are even now devising Cymric place names for places which never had any until today.’<sup>59</sup> As he puts it:

---

<sup>54</sup> E Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Blackwell: 1983), p 48

<sup>55</sup> *ibid*, p 34

<sup>56</sup> *ibid*, p 55

<sup>57</sup> B Anderson, *Imagined Communities* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (Verso: 1991), p 6

<sup>58</sup> E Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: 1990), p 66, 10

<sup>59</sup> *ibid*, p 112; This is indeed a rather strange statement and assertion of the importance of the word only as written from a historian of ‘history of below’, for whom, surely, oral history should not be denigrated simply by the fact that they were not written on signs? For an analysis of how power and geography writes space – actively geo-graphs it – see G O’Tuathail, *Critical Geopolitics* (university of Minnesota Press: 1996)

History is the raw material for nationalist or ethnic or fundamentalist ideologies, as poppies are the raw material for heroin addiction. The past is an essential element, perhaps *the* essential element in these ideologies. If there is no suitable past, it can always be invented...I used to think that the profession of history, unlike that of, say, nuclear physics, could at least do no harm. Now I know it can. Our studies can turn into bomb factories. This state of affairs affects us in two ways. We have a responsibility to historical facts in general, and for criticising the politico-ideological abuse of history in particular.<sup>60</sup>

From this dramatic statement, Hobsbawm then goes on to see the historian as needing a strict demarcation between fact and fiction, 'the passions of identity politics.'<sup>61</sup> It is useful in this light to see Catherine Hall's view of Hobsbawm's comment. Hall is sceptical of the strict demarcation between myth and history, and the bracketing of rituals and narratives as outside history proper:

If we are interested in the ways history is lived, how it offers answers to the questions as to who we are and where we come from, if we want to know how we are produced as modern subjects, what narratives from the past enable us to construct identities, how historical memories and the shadows and ghosts of memories are internalised in our lives, then 'the passions of identity politics' may drive us to ask new questions of old and new sources, fiction may give us necessary tools, the construction of new myths may be part of our work.<sup>62</sup>

It is also fairly clear that Hobsbawm in analysing nationalism as a top-down invention indicates his high-minded rationalism Marxist complicity with top-down power as he sees it, citing governmental reports such as the notorious Blue Books 1847 as a 'factual' historical document on education in Wales.<sup>63</sup>

A less negative approach to cultural nationalism can be found in Benedict Anderson's seminal work, *Imagined Communities*. Like Gellner, Anderson sees nationalism as a modern phenomenon, although this time linked to the creation of print commodities from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards, rather than to industrialism.<sup>64</sup> This he sees as inaugurating a movement toward nationhood due to the printing of books in the vernacular aimed at a (relatively) mass audience, rather than the Latin manuscripts

---

<sup>60</sup> E Hobsbawm 'The New Threat to History' in *New York Review*, 1993, p 63

<sup>61</sup> *ibid*

<sup>62</sup> C Hall, 'Histories, Empires and the Postcolonial Moment' in I Chambers and L Curti *The Post-colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons* (Routledge: 1996), p 66

<sup>63</sup> E Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, p 112; the 'Blue Books', or, the Report on the State of Education in Wales of 1947 is the subject of chapter 1.

<sup>64</sup> B Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 37-46

housed for specialists previously.<sup>65</sup> He also sees what Walter Benjamin called ‘empty, homogeneous time’ of linearity and progression as important in this movement and this because it was possible to think of an idea of time as ‘meanwhile’: that is, while one was reading the newspaper, it was possible to imagine others across the nation doing exactly the same thing.<sup>66</sup> Anderson also thinks of phases of nationalism in modular form, from the Creole nationalism of early settlers (which we need not discuss here), to the official nationalism growing in centres such as France and Britain, the last ripe for ‘pirating’ by others, leading to the linguistic nationalisms of the late nineteenth century.<sup>67</sup> Anderson’s contribution is a very important and influential one, and indicates useful avenues to develop. It also lacks the patronising view of ‘false consciousness’ found in many Marxist treatments of nationalism as mere ideological falsehood.

There have been problems raised about Anderson’s thesis, and these lead us back to postcolonialism and my own approach. The first is that this approach appears to flatten time somewhat – it in the end ‘spatialises’ it. There appears to be no particular reason why the nation cannot be Benjamin’s view of time as a radical element of the past as radicalised by ‘the time of the now’, as opposed to the modern ‘empty homogeneous time’ proposed by Anderson. That is, it may not be imagined as a stable horizontal community without the disruptions of national narratives to disrupt that homogeneity. As Benjamin puts it of this radicalised view of time (albeit in problematic gendered terms):

Historicism gives the ‘eternal’ image of the past; historical materialism supplies a unique experience with the past. The historical materialist leaves it to others to be drained by the whore called ‘Once upon a time’ in historicism’s bordello. He remains in control of his powers, man enough to blast open the continuum of history.<sup>68</sup>

This dynamic view of the past allows for this reinscription seen in blasting open this continuum, and to move away from history as a simple rosary of beads moving from event to event to view as a ‘constellation’ – history is infused with ‘the presence of

---

<sup>65</sup> *ibid*

<sup>66</sup> *ibid*, 23-6

<sup>67</sup> *ibid*, p 81

<sup>68</sup> W Benjamin, ‘Theses on the Philosophy of History’, in his *Illuminations* (Pimlico: 1999), p 254

the now.’<sup>69</sup> There is also a time-lag, in that events become ‘historical posthumously’, in that they must be *written [or narrated]*. Thus, Benjamin advocates historical writing as ‘weak messianism’, looking back to move forward, an idea that one can link to the politicisation of memory and narration.<sup>70</sup> Anderson allows the importance of narratives and memory to nationhood, noting in a section entitled ‘The Biography of Nations’ that:

All profound changes in consciousness, by their very nature, bring with them characteristic amnesias. Out of such oblivions, in specific historical circumstances, spring narratives<sup>71</sup>

However, Anderson’s view of nations emerging from the empty time of modernity, and thus arising in terms of ‘horizontal’ community, seems to close off from this analysis the importance of the past, of narration. Indeed his view of nationalism as falling into modular stages also seems to reject any agency for narratives to have an effect. As Chatterjee has questioned Anderson’s modular notion of national development, where some models of nationalism become available for piracy, but appear to be adopted *as* holistic models by national leaders who seem to do this deterministically.<sup>72</sup> As Chatterjee asks of this framework: ‘what is left to imagine?’<sup>73</sup>

Homi Bhabha has also noted this problem of temporality and the nation with regard to Anderson’s work. Bhabha sees the problem as lying in the idea of the nation as merely a ‘horizontal’ affiliation of a people who imagine themselves as ‘homogeneous’. Using a view of time similar to that developed by Benjamin as the radical alternative to ‘empty, homogeneous time’ allows for views of identity that re-makes itself anew and ruptures dominant discourses. For Bhabha, this view of identity (which he sees as ‘performative’) makes the categories of ‘nation’ as ‘empirical sociological category or a holistic cultural entity’, or a community imagined merely as ‘horizontal’, unfeasible.<sup>74</sup> It becomes necessary to look at the nation in ‘double-time’, with the ‘horizontal’ spatial field ruptured by ‘vertical’ temporality and narrations, and vice-versa:

---

<sup>69</sup> *ibid*, 255, 252-3

<sup>70</sup> *ibid*, p 255

<sup>71</sup> B Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, p 204

<sup>72</sup> P Chatterjee, ‘Whose Imagined Community?’ in B Anderson & G Balakrishnan *Mapping the Nation* (Verso: 1996), p 21

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*

<sup>74</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 140-1,

It is precisely in reading between these borderlines of the nation-space that we can see how the concept of the 'people' emerges within a range of discourses as a double narrative movement. The people are not simply historical events or parts of a patriotic body politic. They are also a complex rhetorical strategy of social reference: their claim to be representative provokes crisis within a process of signification and discursive address. We then have a contested conceptual territory where the nation's people must be thought in double-time; the people are the historical 'objects' of a nationalist pedagogy, giving the discourse an authority that is based on the pre-given or constituted historical origin *in the past*; the people are also the 'subjects' of a process of signification that must erase any prior or originary presence of the nation-people to demonstrate the prodigious, living principles of the people as contemporaneity: as that sign of the *present* through which national life is redeemed and iterated as a reproductive process.<sup>75</sup>

In Bhabha's account, the authority to speak for 'the people' as a horizontal community is constituted by the past, which it is dependent upon, but at the same time must 'forget' to speak for the present, the play between these mean that there can be no closure for identity. This also means that nations are split from within:

In place of the polarity of a prefigurative self-generating nation 'in-itself' and extrinsic other nations, the performative introduces a temporality of the 'in-between'. The boundary that marks the nation's selfhood interrupts the self-generating time of national production and disrupts the signification of the people as homogeneous. The problem is not simply the 'selfhood' of the nation as opposed to the otherness of other nations. We are confronted with the nation split within itself, articulating the heterogeneity of its population. The barred nation *It/self*, alienated from its eternal self generation, becomes a liminal signifying space that is *internally* marked by the discourses of minorities, the heterogeneous histories of contending peoples, antagonistic authorities and tense locations of cultural difference.<sup>76</sup>

In viewing national identity as narrated and performed, full identity is impossible and so is hybrid, and this is so even when nationalisms declare otherwise. It is this narration and possibility of different narrations that allows for the renewing and rearticulation of identities, for different articulations of identity to emerge. A full national identity cannot exist as such. However, in opposition to views of narrations as simply the same act repeated similarly in different holistic cultural entities, intracultural transmissions also involve the translation of discourses into a different context, with different relations of power, and different effects.

---

<sup>75</sup> *ibid*, p 145

<sup>76</sup> *ibid*, p 148

In analysing such relations in India, Partha Chatterjee has been interested in this dynamic rearticulation of identities which we have noted in the relationship between nationalism in colonised countries in relation to Western nationalisms. This is what he sees as a derivative discourse of nationalism, which he nonetheless indicates how viewing it in this hybrid fashion indicates how it is a dynamic reconfiguration of past and present, of 'Eastern' and 'Western' influences into different hybrid cultures, an encounter which goes to transform the colonised self in asserting difference from the Coloniser.<sup>77</sup> In other words, while its cultural self derives from the Western influence of nationalism, it constructs a different narrative of nationhood through this encounter with the Coloniser's discourse.

Chatterjee's work develops Gellner's passing point that nationalist resistance arises from within the education institutions of the 'alien' culture, and develops its own high culture from that perspective.<sup>78</sup> It is also a development of Gellner's passing remark that there is a link between 'nationalism and the processes of colonialism, imperialism and de-colonialism.'<sup>79</sup> For Chatterjee, the role of the cultural aspect and self-affirmation of nationalism precedes the 'political' side, and is in fact arguably more important than it.<sup>80</sup> Chatterjee, in his *The Nation and its Fragments* looks from an interdisciplinary perspective at the construction of nationalism in Bengal, where he charts the creation of a new 'inner domain of culture' by elites which is both modern and non-western, drawing upon and incorporating differing fragmentary narratives of marginalized groups within Bengal.<sup>81</sup> Cultural contestation thus occurs within the nation, and this means that there are several different articulations of 'nation', some of which become hegemonic, some becoming incorporated, and some involve contestations – each indicating Bhabha's view of the ambivalence of the concept, and of authority to 'speak for' the 'nation', as it is always articulated in relation to other issues:

---

<sup>77</sup> P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (Zed Books: 1993), p 11-17, 27

<sup>78</sup> E Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* p 57

<sup>79</sup> *ibid*, p 42

<sup>80</sup> P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*, p 131-166; one can see his somewhat critical view of Nehru's Indian independence as 'passive revolution', where there is little substantive change other than one group replacing another at the head of the state apparatus.

<sup>81</sup> P Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments* (Princeton: 1993)

the narrative and psychological force that nationness brings to bear on cultural production and political projection is the effect of the ambivalence of the 'nation' as a narrative strategy. As an apparatus of symbolic power, it produces a continual slippage of categories, like sexuality, class affiliation, territorial paranoia, or 'cultural difference' in the act of writing the nation. What is displayed in this displacement and repetition of terms is the nation as the measure of the liminality of cultural modernity.<sup>82</sup>

It is in its relation and slippage of nation within these other categories with which we can understand the (re)production of 'Wales', and the positions of ambivalent authority from which ones speaks for 'it'. In doing so we see how Welsh identities have been formed and re-formed in dramatic encounters and synergy with other cultures.

#### Postcolonial Theory in Wales

Before moving to the analysis of Welsh identities in my work, it is useful to analyse the core issues of debate on postcolonialism in Wales. During the course of its quarterly publication in 2005, the *New Welsh Review* conducted a debate on the merits of postcolonialism and its application to Wales. Significantly, and as we shall see, mistakenly, the main question around which the debate was conducted 'was Wales colonised?' leading to the question 'is Wales postcolonial?' The debate centred around the publication of *A Hundred Years of Fiction* by Stephen Knight, and Dai Smith's hostile review in the *New Welsh Review*. Knight's work views Anglo-Welsh literature as moving in a postcolonial fashion from 'first-contact romance' to a burgeoning anti-hegemonic movement for integration and, finally toward independence. In this framework, Knight moves in linear fashion from 'colonisation' to the 'postcolonial'. For Knight:

the experiences Welsh people have had and have communicated through fiction are primarily those of colonisation, whatever the main dynamic in any given situation, and post-colonial analysis is the best way of understanding the complexities and the products of those experiences.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p 140

<sup>83</sup> S Knight *A Hundred Years of Fiction* (Cardiff: 2004), p xiv

This provocative analysis is grist for the mill of the revisionist Welsh historian, Dai Smith, who makes a vociferous critique of the use of postcolonialism in Wales in the *New Welsh Review*. Smith's review led to a series of responses and counter-ripostes, articles and letters in the *New Welsh Review*, raising a series of questions on the role of postcolonialism in Wales. From this Welsh debate I wish to interrogate how postcolonialism has been applied to Wales, and the tensions and problems it has raised, indicating the contested ideas on identity around the concept of 'Wales'.

The main thrust of Smith's attack on Knight's work is its historical framework and basis for the analysis. For Smith, the historical basis is without any 'substantial foundation', is a 'reductionist' account that 'flattens and homogenises', and is 'intellectually untenable'.<sup>84</sup> Smith utilises sources to illustrate that Wales was not colonised, certainly not after 1536, which makes the argument for a 'postcolonial Wales', for him, spurious.<sup>85</sup> It is revealing in its own analysis of history, as it gives absolutely no quarter to any idea of Welsh history as one of colonisation. Indeed, for Smith the Welsh 'colonised their own country'.<sup>86</sup> In contrast to Knight's literary criticism:

the historian, even one instinctively sympathetic to paths not taken, has to emphasise congeries of interests, geographical and social differential, force but also choice, resistance and *consensus*, because, in all the detail a novelist may unpick, that is *what occurred*.<sup>87</sup>

Here, it is useful to note that Smith quotes Eric Hobsbawm's view of the historian's task approvingly in his work *Wales: A Question for History*.<sup>88</sup> In implacably viewing the industrial experience as the motor of history, he sees other forms of identity as inherently irrational. In this viewpoint, it is no surprise that 'Smith's work has, generally, given a poor account of Wales outside the industrial south-east, of ethnic and minority Wales, and of Welsh speaking Wales, not to mention women's experience in Wales'.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> D Smith, *Psycho-Colonialism in New Welsh Review* Winter 2005, p 26

<sup>85</sup> 1536 is the date of the 'Act of Union' between England and Wales, although it may also be called the 'Act of Incorporation'. Placing Welshmen as legal equals to the English, it also infamously banned the use of Welsh in public institutions.

<sup>86</sup> D Smith, *Wales: A Question For History* (Seren: 1999), p 50; Dai Smith, Letter in *New Welsh Review*, Summer 2005

<sup>87</sup> D Smith, 'Psycho-Colonialism', p 28; first emphasis his, second mine

<sup>88</sup> D Smith, *Wales: A Question For History*, p 19-20

<sup>89</sup> Patrick McGuinness, letter in *New Welsh Review*, Spring 2005



As in Hobsbawm, Smith implicitly posits myth-making upon the Welsh language enthusiasts, pointing out that loss of the language was inevitable under industrialisation, and that many Welsh people chose, for rational economic reasons, to speak English.<sup>90</sup> However, this ‘choice’ is rather a narrow one and in explaining such processes as simply, and neutrally, ‘what occurred’ dismisses a myriad of power relations other than economic.<sup>91</sup> Such power relations are not seen as part of the process, and indeed, such a view of process flattens and homogenises. There is a sense in this rational teleological economic process that ‘what occurred’ may translate as ‘might is right’.

With regard to the historical points Jane Aaron responds to Smith with useful insights. She points out that Smith’s view that colonisation never happened is refuted in the case of the Act of Union by Norman Davies’s view that ‘one could not hope for a better example of colonial cultural policy’.<sup>92</sup> She points out that the support of the gentry for the measure in no way precludes a colonial situation, given that ‘winning the accord of local rulers is a very common feature of colonisation’ – the occurrence in India of such a ‘comprador class’ did not make it ‘less of a British colony’.<sup>93</sup> The Welsh gentry are merely another example of this. Moreover, Smith is seen to believe ‘that if he can show that Wales was never unified, never spoke with one voice, then he has persuasively proven that it could not have been colonised’.<sup>94</sup> This is therefore a contention that colonisation leads to fragmentation of cultural identity.

These are both well-argued interventions, and are useful here in indicating some of the problems of assuming or rejecting the term ‘colonised’. It is significant that the debate seems to centre upon the question of whether Wales was colonised or not. That this is the central question seems to misunderstand one of the main points of

---

<sup>90</sup> D Smith, *Wales: A Question For History*, p 49-52

<sup>91</sup> Terry Eagleton (*Crazy John and the Bishop and Other Essays on Irish Culture* (Cork University Press: 1998), p 319) makes a similar point in relation to Irish revisionism: ‘most feminists reject the idea that men are simply creatures resting between rapes, but nonetheless find in that act something typical of patriarchal sexual relations in general. Hamstrung by his empiricist education, the revisionist historian is sometimes slow to appreciate the symbolic dimension of action, and must accordingly go to school with the cultural critic’

<sup>92</sup> N Davies, *The Isles* (Macmillan: 1999), p 418

<sup>93</sup> J Aaron, ‘Postcolonial Change’ in *New Welsh Review* Spring 2005, p 36

<sup>94</sup> *ibid*

postcolonialism, in that this ‘postcolonial’ is a *problematizing* term. Both Smith and Aaron’s response is one of knowing what colonialism ‘is’, and then state that it does or does not apply to Wales as a categorisation. If this was the point of postcolonialism it would be better termed colonial studies. The polarised positions constructed around this assumed question of ‘was Wales colonised?’ reminds one of M Wynn Thomas’s excellent account of hybridity in Welsh and Anglo-Welsh literature, and how its literary criticism is demarcated between these borders:

At times, scholars of Anglo-Welsh literature seem almost to conspire together with their Welsh language counterparts to give the impression that the history of modern Wales can be neatly divided into two literatures, with industrial experience being the monopoly of the Anglo-Welsh and rural life the preserve of the Welsh. This allows writers of both camps to preen themselves by claiming to represent the real Wales.<sup>95</sup>

It is in this sense that one can see ‘othering’ on both sides of the debate. While one can doubt whether Dai Smith is familiar with postcolonialism, the way the ‘postcolonial’ is transplanted into Wales makes it eminently possible for him to criticise it as he does. Certainly, using the term ‘colonialism’ unproblematically in Wales, especially from the nineteenth century - where this study begins - is something of a problem. But the term ‘colonialism’ is *problematized* by – not *superseded* by – postcolonialism.<sup>96</sup>

In keeping the register largely to Wales and England in this discussion, the binaries are reinforced, and stabilised. However, in a postcolonial view the role of Empire is not simply ‘projected outside’ Britain. As Peter Hulme states, it is relevant for all whom colonialism has encountered:

---

<sup>95</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures: The Two Literatures of Wales* (University of Wales Press: 1999), p 64

<sup>96</sup> It is ironic that many of a series of questions Dai Smith (‘Psycho-Colonialism’, p 26) himself asks are perfectly relevant questions to a postcolonial project, although one would question the alternative assertion of class unity in itself here, although his implied answers to the question illustrate an assumption of what postcolonial theory involves:

‘Colonisation by England is the key factor. But which England is meant and when did it happen? Why can Welsh regional diversity and social complexity be sometimes acknowledged but not comparable English specifics? Can we really understand the forcible settlement of the Pale in Catholic Ireland in the same way as the demographic shifts in both Victorian Wales and England? How would we characterise the industrial and urban development of Lancashire and Yorkshire (in colonial terms?) when there is no ‘significant ethnic other’? How can analyses of class, power, exploitation and dissent separate out the unity of purpose the British working class found, in its occupational unions and its pan-regional parties, across the British Isles? ...Who is ‘colonising’ whom if we take the national salt out of the old power equation?’

If 'post-colonial' is a useful word, then it refers to a *process* of disengagement from the whole colonial syndrome which takes many forms and is probably inescapable for all those whose worlds have been marked by that set of phenomena: 'post-colonial' is (or should be) a descriptive not an evaluative term...[not] some kind of badge of merit<sup>97</sup>

In Wales, consent rather than coercion was the main historical relation. However, this does not preclude a postcolonial reading. Indeed, given that the imperial relation constructed the identity of the coloniser as well as the colonised, there is no reason that we cannot attempt to analyse the construction at the centre in any case. Its position at the centre of the global British Empire must surely have influenced the identities that were constructed in Wales. The fact that it lies on the periphery of that centre makes its position of 'inbetweenness' all the more relevant for postcolonial study.

Much of the critique outlined here is that of the postcolonial writer Kirsti Bohata. She finds the *New Welsh Review* debate disappointing in not engaging with 'literary theory', although she finds this unsurprising given that the first intervention was from a historian. She makes several criticisms on Knight's work, in particular pointing to its 'bizarre' historical framework, and also to the rather problematic reduction of the debate to one of empiricism:

The relevance of postcolonial criticism is not dependent on monolithic political models – on proving that Wales is/was a colony and is/will be postcolonial – but is to be found in specific and detailed engagement with the array of postcolonial ideas in the context of Welsh literary and cultural specificities.<sup>98</sup>

As is already clear, I concur with this statement. However the main point I would wish to address is Bohata's separation of the 'literary' from other 'material' analysis, by positioning herself as card-carrying 'literary theorist' against 'Dai Smith: historian':

while we should welcome historians' interest in creative writing, it is important that it is recognised that literature offers much more than imaginatively fleshed-out representations of the strikes, booms and busts that are traced in archives, old newspapers and ledgers. The value of a body of

---

<sup>97</sup> P Hulme, 'Including America' in *Ariel* 26 (1995), p 120

<sup>98</sup> K Bohata, 'Psycho-colonialism Revisited' in *New Welsh Review*, Autumn 2005, p 39

literature is more than a series of windows on historical experience, although it may offer this too. Creative writing may well include overtly political messages – propaganda if you like – and be rightly valued for this...But *of course* Welsh writers also engage with the existential, the psychological, and *of course* a myriad of social and personal constructs such as gender and categories of sexuality, not to mention an engagement with literary forms and traditions, influences and inflects their work.<sup>99</sup>

Bohata's view of the value of literature beyond only social realism is well made. However, Bohata here appears to share Smith's idea of what historical work is (that is, 'strikes, booms and busts'), and appears to demarcate disciplines in a way that is unacceptable. Even a brief survey of recent 'historical' work can illustrate their shared concerns with what she marks out for 'literary theory'. Foucault's view of discourse and power already discussed makes this demarcation somewhat redundant, in that it is precisely such disciplines that should be critiqued. Bohata's suspicious view of the range of uses for postcolonial analyses indicates a separation of the literary (textual analysis) and material (historical analysis). She retains a suspicion of its use for material or historical analysis, and attempts to demarcate areas for its use to being within literary studies. Her wish to retain postcolonial for literary theory can be seen in her view that such analysis' value 'seems to be in reaching deeper understandings of inter-cultural dynamics, especially expressed in literature'.<sup>100</sup>

Bohata is certainly not the first to exemplify postcolonial theory's problems with material analyses. Such a demarcation of postcolonialism's theoretical terrain has been criticised by Ania Loomba, and is linked to the institutions in which postcolonialism has flourished – that is, precisely in the field of literary (and particularly, English) studies. The danger of this is a reification of literary texts as *the* transmitters of discourse, a fact that allows the slippage of the literary text from its social existence. In such an analysis of the text, 'ideology moves from being "material in its effect" or "structured like a language" to being material *in itself* or *the same as* language'.<sup>101</sup> Bohata's division of academic labour works in a similar fashion by eliding the problem by placing academics in demarcated specialisms.

---

<sup>99</sup> *ibid*, p 35

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, p 38

<sup>101</sup> A Loomba, 'Overworlding the Third World' in P Williams & L Chrisman *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory* (Longman: 1993)

There are dangers of textuality here, that is, the separation of text from history and society. The problem is therefore the link between materialism and textuality. Certainly, Bohata's work *Postcolonialism Revisited* is one of the finest books of postcolonial literary theory, but it is fairly clear that its main focus is on – and its theoretical insights of society mainly derived from – literary texts. Thus for example, the excellent chapter on forestation and the way the forestry commission's work in Wales was seen as a colonialist appropriation of common land is analysed and explained through a series of poems.<sup>102</sup> This is not a problem in itself, but it is different to what this thesis is engaged with, which is also interested in the apparatuses which allow for the production of texts as well as their positioning in a national narrative – these 'texts' are not in this instance limited only to literary texts, but also governmental reports and documents, rituals, music and so on, which I assume can be read productively in relation to power and the discursive possibilities which allow for their emergence. It is in this way that I depart from Bohata's work.

The most influential Welsh theorist in relation to postcolonialism remains Raymond Williams. Williams is unique among Welsh writers, in that he has had a direct influence on postcolonialism with his treatments of culture, literature and imperialism. Edward W Said credits him as a decisive influence. Williams did not write on Wales outside his fiction until later in life, and as Daniel Williams has noted, these works have been ignored.<sup>103</sup> It is interesting to note his description of the Welsh: 'to the extent that we are a people, we have been defeated, colonised, penetrated, incorporated'.<sup>104</sup> He is very careful to note that 'the English...are far more various than myths allow'.<sup>105</sup> He thus indicates the complications of identity and the dangers of generalised statements:

It can be said that the Welsh people have been oppressed by the English state for some seven centuries. Yet it can also be said that the English people have been oppressed by the English State for even longer. In any such general statements all the real complications of history are overridden. Even the names, when they are examined, begin to blur or dissolve.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited* (University of Wales Press: 2004), p 80-103

<sup>103</sup> D G Williams, 'Introduction: The Return of the Native' in D G Williams (ed), R Williams, *Who Speaks for Wales: Nation, Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003, p xv

<sup>104</sup> R Williams, 'Welsh Culture' in *Who Speaks for Wales?*, p 9

<sup>105</sup> *ibid*, p 10

<sup>106</sup> R Williams, 'Wales and England' in *Who Speaks for Wales?*, p 16

It is interesting to note that Williams also refer to Wales as post-colonial, by which he means the breaking out from psychological baggage, of renewed confidence, and of movement away from a fixation with the past:

[There] are some signs of a post-colonial culture, conscious all the time of its own real strengths and potentials, longing only to be itself, to become its own world but with so much, too much, on its back to be able, consistently, to face its real future.<sup>107</sup>

Raymond Williams' focus on cultural politics involves a clear separation of nation and state, which allows for a social analysis of the relation between England and Wales beyond the dominance of the state. As Daniel Williams puts it:

The advantage...of Williams's rigorous distinction between a culturally defined 'people' or 'nation' and a politically defined 'state' is that it allows us to recognize that the political expression of national identity can take many legitimate forms...There is no predetermined shape that Welshness will inevitably take, for that elusive entity – 'Wales' – is not a neutral frame within which any array of forces contend for power, but is, rather, itself the subject of persistent cultural and political contestation. Williams recognises that it is through the possibility and necessity of a shifting diversity of levels – ethnic, regional, national, international – for both individuals and communities that a space is constructed for the creation of a culturally diverse society based on the acceptance of a necessary ambiguity in cultural and political identity.<sup>108</sup>

This indicates precisely how the concept 'Wales' moves away from the empirical category or culturally unitary category and it is this contestation from within as well as from without that allows us to ask Williams's question 'Who speaks for Wales?' as related to discourse, power and authority.

Foucault and postcolonial theory give this thesis the tools to look at these issues with a clear conceptual toolbox. It is in looking at the micro-physics of power and the space created for such speech, as well as the ambivalent bases of authority from which that speech is spoken, that this thesis takes its starting-point. It also attempts to articulate these ideas in relation to localised contestation and to general and parallel processes. Framing it differently to merely 'EnglandandWales' is something I see as a

---

<sup>107</sup> R Williams, 'Welsh Culture', p 9

<sup>108</sup> D G Williams, 'Introduction: Return of the Native' in *Who Speaks for Wales*, p xlv

vital component of the thesis, and is inspired by Michel Foucault, Raymond Williams and postcolonialism.

## ***Research Questions and Structure***

The title of the thesis, ‘Welshing (on) postcolonialism’, involves a project that aims at placing Wales in a different framework, and one that is controversial to some postcolonial critics, and so there is an element of ‘Welshing on postcolonialism’. The authors of the survey of postcolonial theory, *The Empire Writes Back*, dismiss claims of viewing Wales and Scotland in a postcolonial framework due to the fact that ‘complicity in the British imperial enterprise makes it difficult for colonised people outside Britain to accept their identity as post-colonial.’<sup>109</sup> We have noted the problems in Said of placing boundaries of inside and outside in culture. On these points, Foucault’s discourse analysis and postcolonial concepts of hybridity can be useful in understanding the power relations and identities in Wales, as complicit and resistant within particular discourses. ‘Welshing on postcolonialism’ insists on not demarcating these boundaries so clearly to close the discussion.

Dipresh Chakrabarty states the task of postcolonialism as ‘provincialising Europe’.<sup>110</sup> In framing the local and the global within Empire my hope is to at least find a different way of looking at these issues and to engage in a way with both provincialising ‘Britain’ (or in postcolonial studies – ‘Europe’ – the quotation marks denoting the way in which this term has a symbolic value), and also – possibly – of ‘worlding’ Wales, whereby one can look at one of the ‘peripheral’ regions of Britain as not being limited only to comparison with its neighbour, ‘England’. This, I think, allows space for thinking of Wales, not simply as oppressed or not, but rather to view power and identity as working in a different way to this binarism, which allows us to look at ‘Wales’ (or perhaps ‘the Welsh’, whomever they are) as being resistant and complicit, often in the same movement, and constructed in those encounters. In framing Wales in this way it is thus possible to view complicity and resistance as arising within various discourses. From this viewpoint it is possible to use

---

<sup>109</sup> B Ashcroft, G Griffiths and H Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (Routledge: 1994), p 33

<sup>110</sup> D Chakrabarty, ‘Postcoloniality and the Artifice of history: Who speaks for “Indian” pasts?’ In *Representations* 57 (Winter 1992), p 1-3

postcolonial theory. The aim may not be to categorise Wales as postcolonial, but it may be possible to view Wales, in a suggestive phrase used by Iwan Bala that echoes Chakrabarty's project, as 'post-provincial', as articulating global processes within a localised space.<sup>111</sup>

This introductory chapter has placed this thesis within the various theoretical contexts of identity and identification to which it is a contribution. The thesis analyses the context of power relations within which the construction of Wales and Welshness operates, and does so using a Postcolonial and Foucauldian framework analysing the nodal point where various discourses intersect and have political and cultural effects. In this situation, 'Wales' cannot be taken to be essential in meaning or identity, but becomes meaningful in relation to other discourses of class, status, gender in institutional or discursive forms such as education, ritual, literary theory and so on. Identification is also not merely specific or parochial but is made through the charting of different levels in which the universal is also constructed. Given that borders between these different cultures and societies are not bound, but blurred, it follows that we can also view encounters as *intracultural*,<sup>112</sup> as vectors and discourses that cross inbetween and within hybrid cultures split within themselves.

What I have chosen to study within this framework follows from this logic. They are specific, in that they analyse particular discourses and events, different articulations of identity and contestations that occur around them. The events and discourses analysed appear in roughly chronological order, although given that these events are narrated retrospectively and placed in different contexts, this is not a clear-cut and linear narrative. Each chapter analyses the play between complicity and resistance. They analyse different articulations of trajectories of power and knowledge in order to understand the construction of 'Wales' at particular nodal points within a network of power relations.

The first chapter analyses the event of the Report on Education in Wales in 1847, rechristened in 1854 in R J Derfel's play 'The Treachery of the Blue Books', but does

---

<sup>111</sup> I Bala, 'Horizon Wales: Visual Art and the Postcolonial' in J Aaron and C Williams *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005), p 234

<sup>112</sup> rather than multi- or inter-, which retain the ideas of discrete cultures prior to cultural encounters



so from the particular Foucauldian position of looking at this report as indicative of the state's intervention into life in the nineteenth century, in what Foucault calls governmentality. Thus, practices of education, and the lives of those educated are categorised, criticised and placed in a pseudo-scientific framework. While state education did not occur in Britain until 1870, the government did retain the right to analyse, place standards upon, and categorise schools and education in such reports and surveys. This particular report gave ire to Welsh nonconformists in particular (although not them alone). This has been taken to be because of the attacks on the Welsh language, and nonconformity, and also of the alleged unchaste nature of Welsh women. While such a colonial mentality is in the report, the fact that such a mentality is there does not in itself explain the nature of the response, nor does it explain wholly the position from which that response was made.

The answer lies in the subject matter: education. What this response indicated was the high level of *agreement* between the report and its critics. While the report attacked Welsh women's chastity, Welsh respondents claimed they were more virtuous than English women, indicating agreement about the undesirability of female sexuality. Moreover, while denying the picture painted by the report, Welsh 'pastoral power' attempted to both prove, and make sure, that this was not so. It therefore accepted the moral assumption of the Report, while contesting its findings. The main issue was who was best placed to cultivate Welsh people, rather than disagreement about what that involved.

Analysing this discourse of education as cultivation also draws parallels with the role of education discourse in colonial India. India was vital for the construction of 'English education' as channelling moral and civil values, which grew out of both utilitarian and evangelical discourses on education and viewing India as a *tabula rasa* for experimentation, and where many of their aims converged. This chapter therefore looks at the bringing in of Wales into the state surveillance and disciplinary apparatus at a particular point around particular discourses of education, and the tensions and reinscription of that discipline into an idea of Welsh 'civility', and the material effects of that encounter.

The second chapter looks at the ritual of high cultural performance of sovereignty, with the creation of the 1911 investiture of the Prince of Wales. This takes its cue from the ‘invented tradition’ literature, but dispenses with that literature’s rationalist dismissal of symbols as transparent fabrication and fakery as opposed to their own scientific ‘truth’.<sup>113</sup> In looking at the ritual as performance, the chapter indicates how its meaning construction is unstable, and can also leave spaces for subversion. This is also because this particular ritual is scripted and repeated fifty-eight years later in 1969 for the investiture of Prince Charles, which opens space for debate by republicans and anti-monarchist against ideas of ‘Britishness’ and to articulate a national narrative that decouples Welsh identity from British imperial identity. I argue that without the ‘authorised’ version there would not be space for subversion to the crown’s position in Wales. However, I also indicate how resistance to that symbol of sovereignty also reasserts some of the conservative values in a different context and time, through its valorisation of past Welsh sovereigns.

In looking at the narration and myth-making of these events I analyse which myth has come to be more salient around this particular event, through Welsh-language publications of protest poetry and the Welsh curriculum, and I argue that in a sense the 1969 myth of the ritual as national shame has ‘won’ through its prominent position, at least among Welsh speakers. This chapter serves to indicate how events are performed and can be read differently at different times, indicating also how meanings and identifications are highly unstable, although I also find connections between these seeming opposed camps of ‘Welshness’, in their fidelity to sovereign symbolism.

The third chapter analyses the parallel developments of English Literature’s construction in converging moral value, language and literary and classical tradition, with that of a marginal position in Wales that articulated a similar connection between these areas; in the literary criticism of Saunders Lewis. Due to their relative academic positions, these discourses were to have radically different effects when translated

---

<sup>113</sup> The exception here is undoubtedly Prys Morgan’s chapter ‘From a Death to a View: The Hunt for the Welsh Past in the Romantic Past’ which looks at the romantic construction of tradition as a reaffirmation of Welshness in response to contemporary conditions, without a condescending view of the untruth of these inventions. [E Hobsbawm and T Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983), p 43-100]

into these different contexts. 'English Literature' was hegemonic in its view of the moral value of its subject for education. Within a similar radical and conservative framework, the effect of Lewis's national narrative was to radicalise and politicise Welsh culture and attack the consensus of the Liberal Wales of his age. Similarly, Anglo-Welsh criticism constructed its discipline in relation to questions of Welsh authentic traditions.

The chapter ends by moving from the realms of high culture to Welsh pop culture, with an analysis of several works of popular music which indicate an important relation between authenticity and inauthenticity, local and global, with particular reference to the Welsh language. In doing so it indicates how ideas of organic community are articulated and contested. In the end, it can be summarised as indicating the necessity of viewing culture, not only as in Lewis's exhortation to 'stand in the gap'; but requires the supplementary question of 'where-are-you-between'.<sup>114</sup> As such, the chapter indicates how it is possible to play with ideas of authenticity and to construct discourses that relate the local and the international. In the end, in analysing who speaks for Wales this work aims to look at the spaces inbetween where it is possible to subvert and contest identity and authority.

### **Back 'Home' to Beddgelert**

Returning for a moment to the very local, my home village of Beddgelert, does the fact that its 'founding myth' occurs *after* its naming have relevance to our ideas of signification? Does not the linking of this seemingly innocuous story to both colonial appropriation of literature, linked with the knowledge apparatus of Orientalism and the dawn of the popular press which transmits such fantasies to Britain, bring a different interconnection with Empire and so local and global interconnections? And does the use of this story to provide a sanitised, stereotypical and kitsch view of Welsh mythology not illustrate a linking of the ideational field of Celticism and stereotype to tourism, and so the imperial economy? Is this not also a process of

---

<sup>114</sup> 'stand in the gap' is spoken by the character Garmon in Lewis's play *Buchedd Garmon* (Gomer: 1957), p 48; 'Whereareyoubetween?' is the translation of Super Furry Animals song title 'Blerwyttirhwng?' on *Outspaced* (Creation: 1998)

resignification that exposes ambiguities in translation, of wider processes, and of power relations, geography and history? This makes the ‘placing’ and ‘naming’ – the identity of ‘Beddgelert’ – ambivalent and ‘unhomely’.

What are the implications? In viewing the history, in ‘worlding’ and reworking the memory of ‘Beddgelert’, it is then possible to look at this in a different light, and, as Bhabha puts it of the role of ‘unhomeliness’, to envisage ‘a project – at once a vision and construction – that takes you “beyond” yourself in order to return, in a spirit of revision and reconstruction, to the political *conditions* of the present’.<sup>115</sup> It is important to understand how Bhabha uses the idea of ‘beyond’ here, which is not simply transcendence and the arrival at a wholly new and separate situation:

Being in the ‘beyond’, then, is to inhabit an intervening space, as any dictionary will tell you. But to dwell ‘in the beyond’ is also...to be part of a revisionary time, a return to the present to redescribe our cultural contemporaneity; to reinscribe our human, historic commonality; *to touch the future on its hither side*.<sup>116</sup>

I have perhaps made grandiose designs of Beddgelert, which is probably somewhere in the ‘back of beyond’. Nevertheless, it is a view from the marginal spaces that may bring an understanding of the relation of power and cultural hybridity, and the ways in which the encounter(s) with discursive power rearticulates identities. It is with this in mind that this thesis attempts to understand the way in which different forms of Welsh identities have been formed in relation to discursive power and global processes, and also to expose the ambivalence and authority of those particular articulations of identity. It is to this we now turn.

---

<sup>115</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p 3

<sup>116</sup> *ibid*, p 7

## **Chapter 1**

### **Civilising Wales: Governmentality, Pastoral Power and the 1847 Report on Education in Wales**

‘Who Speaks for Wales?’

Raymond Williams<sup>117</sup>

On the 10<sup>th</sup> of March 1846, William Williams, MP for Coventry stood in the House of Commons to argue for an Inquiry into the state of education for the ‘labouring classes’ of Wales. In doing so, he wished to give the Welsh the advantages of State provision already available to Ireland and Scotland, to spread ‘civilised life among the poor Welshmen...will make them a more happy, a less servile – a superior people’.<sup>118</sup> In the context of the Rebecca Riots and the Newport Rising and of disorder among these ‘labouring classes’, still fresh in the memory of the governing classes, he asserted that ‘the moral power of the schoolmaster is a more economical and effectual instrument for governing this people than the bayonet.’<sup>119</sup>

It is unlikely that we could find a more appropriate image to fit Foucault’s reversal of Clausewitz’s dictum: ‘politics is war pursued by other means’.<sup>120</sup> Indeed, Williams’ view is an extremely succinct version of the linking in Foucault’s lecture on governmentality of ‘Security, Population, Territory’, illustrating the need for control of the population through a means of governing that involves the use of ‘moral power’ as intervention into the population.<sup>121</sup> As we shall see the relations of governance, security and morality are vital in a discourse of education which makes its target ‘man’, and constructs a particular ideal of civil man, an ideal toward which the population is to be cultivated. It is these relations that allow for contestation within this discursive field that I shall call ‘English Education’.

---

<sup>117</sup> Raymond Williams, ‘Who Speaks for Wales’ in Daniel Williams (ed) *Who Speaks For Wales? Nation Culture Identity* (University of Wales Cardiff: 2003), p 3

<sup>118</sup> Williams Williams, Speech on education in Wales, Tuesday March 10 1846 (George Woodfal and Son: 1846), p 7

<sup>119</sup> *ibid*

<sup>120</sup> M Foucault, *History of Sexuality: Vol 1* (Penguin: 1998), p 92

<sup>121</sup> M Foucault, *Security, Territory and Population*, in *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994), p 67-72

The subsequent 1847 Report on the State of Education has been seen as a central part of Welsh national history, and in particular upon the relationship between Wales and England. The Report had a remit to analyse Welsh society in its 'needs and circumstances', and its three Commissioners used this remit to view the Welsh as, variously and amongst other descriptions, barbaric, unchaste, immoral, ignorant and uncivil. The Welsh language was viewed as a 'barrier to progress', and Welsh Dissent was described as a seditious and disorderly force in Wales. As Gwyneth Tyson Roberts puts it, the Report:

marked a watershed in officially recognised images of the Welsh people and language, and in Welsh people's images of themselves which they might wish to reject but could not ignore. It has, directly or indirectly, made a major contribution in the shaping of such images and attitudes towards what it meant and what it means to be Welsh, and as such has played a significant role in the process of construction of Welsh identity<sup>122</sup>

This 'officially recognised image' of Wales indicated the increased role of governance on the Welsh population, and this when previously the 'state's attitude – if that is not too active a noun – was essentially one of neglect.'<sup>123</sup>

The Report has, variously, been seen as a means of eliminating the Welsh nation by destroying its language, which clearly contributed to the process of Anglicisation, as well as being central to the creation of a Welsh political public sphere, 'a weapon rather than an instrument of shame' leading eventually to the Liberal election landslide of 1868.<sup>124</sup> However it has also been argued that it resulted in what:

was essentially an English and largely middle-class-cum-populist culture translated and transmuted...which in practice confirmed the status of the language as subaltern and subject.<sup>125</sup>

Alternatively, some critics have taken the view that it cannot be seen as evidence of a general 'cultural imperialism', and that it is an 'evident methodological absurdity' to make 'general claims about colonial mentalities on a single text'<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> G Tyson Roberts, *The Language of the Blue Books: The Perfect Instrument of Empire* (University of Wales Press: 1998), p 3

<sup>123</sup> R Wyn Jones, 'In the Shadow of the First Born: The Colonial Legacy in Welsh Politics' in *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005), p 30

<sup>124</sup> G Evans, *Land of my Fathers* (Lolfa: 1998), p 374; I G Jones, *Mid-Victorian Wales: The Observers and the Observed* (University of Wales Press: 1992), p 165

<sup>125</sup> G A Williams, *When Was Wales?* (Penguin: 1985), p 210

This chapter will argue that this document is a colonial text, or, more accurately, a text shot through with colonial mentalities, and which can be linked to discourses of education, civility and security that were reapplied domestically within the centre after being developed in the colony. I will argue this in a particular way. In noting the dangers outlined by Chris Williams of generalising from a particular text, it will be seen that the Report into the State of Education in Wales of 1847 is linked to wider discourses of education, culture and security both in and outside Wales, and so does not stand alone as an individual text, whereby the commissioners viewpoint can be dismissed as an ‘extreme’ but an isolated case, and so irrelevant in the general scheme of things. Discourses of education depend upon authorised discourses of civility and development, childhood and security. They depend therefore on a particular view of ‘man’, both idealised and civil, and brute and savage, but with culture *as cultivation* as a decisive factor in socialisation. This view could then be linked to civil and barbarous cultures as such. In this chapter, this will be seen as the difference between constructions of the *Anglicised* (viewed as particular to be brought in to civility) and the (idealised and universalised) *English* subject.

My argument will link the Report with the Macaulay Minutes on Education in India of 1835, as well as more general developments, pointing out the many similarities. However, the argument will not be based simply on similitude, whereby it is quite possible to dismiss this evidence as circumstantial or coincidental. As a basis for my argument, I will use Foucault’s notion of governmental rationality (what he terms ‘governmentality’) to illustrate that the educational and cultivating discourse was invested into the public sphere through the rising problematisation of ‘the population’ and security. Raymond Williams has indicated how the word culture is linked with ‘cultivation’ and being ‘cultivated’ and changes from a ‘physical to a social and education sense’ from the seventeenth century onwards.<sup>127</sup> Education thus links to a hierarchy of relative development, and it is in this sense as linked to discourses of power and knowledge that I wish to analyse discourses of education. As I will analyse this first in India and then in Wales, education is a disciplining force that constructs an

---

<sup>126</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales: An Essay in Historiography and Postcoloniality’ in J Aaron and C Williams, *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005) p 6, citing Stephen Howe

<sup>127</sup> Raymond Williams, *Keywords* (Fontana: 1976), p 88, 92

‘ideal’ rational actor who can act ‘naturally’ in the public and economic sphere. Foucault’s analysis allows us to link the state to the technologies of power, which links morality, civility, and economic rationality to the disciplined individual, positing this as a particular (but universalised) *identity*. The tensions within this can be seen in the contrast between the idealised civil Englishman, and the attempt to anglicise native subjects.

As important as the views of the report itself, is the response to the report and its effects. Here I look at the contemporary responses of Rev Evan Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), Jane Williams (Ysgafell) and Lewis Edwards in particular, before looking at their effects. It is clear that despite the views on the derogatory views of the Welsh language included in the report, and the acknowledgement by contemporary commentators that it had been ‘done a wrong’, the main politicised response was linked also to religion, and in particular to gender and sexuality, in defence of the alleged lack of chastity of Welsh women. As we shall see, this response is in fact an illustration of how much in agreement with the discourse of education were those who ‘spoke for’ Wales in this debate. In fact it was a defence of a position of whom educates Wales and its masses, with the (mainly) nonconformists asserting their own pastoral power and solutions to social problems – the basis of which was wholly complicit with the assumptions and ideas within the report they opposed. Foucault notes of the development of governmentality and of diffuse power relations of moral management, categorisation, surveillance of the nineteenth century how they were both ‘individualising and totalising’, and that in this respect they owed much to pastoral power, which Foucault characterises in these terms:

it postulates that certain individuals can, by their religious quality, serve others not as princes, magistrates, prophets, fortune-tellers, benefactors, educationalists, and so on, but as pastors. However, this word designates a very special form of power...This form of power is salvation orientated (as opposed to political power). It is oblativ (as opposed to the principle of sovereignty); it is individualising (as opposed to legal power); it is coextensive and continuous with life; it is linked with a production of truth – the truth of the individual himself.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> M Foucault, ‘The Subject and Power’ in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984* vol 3: *Power* (Penguin: 1994), p 333



The paradox at the heart of pastoral power and the liberal ‘art of governance’ Foucault terms ‘governmentality’ is (if this is an acceptable image for the Welsh) that ‘it individualises by granting, through an essential paradox, as much value to a single sheep as to the entire flock.’<sup>129</sup>

This view of power indicates precisely the sort of social status that was at stake for the Welsh pastors, and how they linked speaking for their community with the salvation of individuals, and the danger they saw in the rise of secular education and further state intervention. In other words, governmentalising this area was a threat to their own power and social status, but was also, in being linked to Anglicisation and the English state, a danger to Welsh culture. Raymond Williams’s question ‘Who speaks for Wales?’ encapsulates the claims of authority on which these interventions into the population through education based their divergent opinions and assessed the situation, and this by both the Report’s commissioners and those who spoke against it.

It is from this point that we see a movement toward policing sexuality, and concomitantly, the basis for arguments for female education – based around similar views of development - that were particularly prominent in Wales toward the end of the nineteenth century. The view expounded in this chapter is that this occurrence arises contingently out of such events and position taking, and that it is problematic to assume this as always a ‘progressive’ or ‘reformist’ rather than a ‘conservative’ position.<sup>130</sup> While a notable event which allowed for women to have means with which to attack patriarchy it is important to note the contingency of such structural relations, it is perhaps best to look at this in terms similar to Foucault’s ‘humane reform’ of prison: as not being best understood as the result of progress as such, but as also constructing ideas of the ‘Welsh woman’ as it ‘liberates’ her.

---

<sup>129</sup> M Foucault, ‘Security, Territory and Population’ in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994), p 68

<sup>130</sup> K M Pannikar analyses the opposition to abolition of the Sati (widow self-immolation) of self-styled ‘conservatives’ who would also support female education. As he puts it: ‘Stereotypical labels such as ‘conservatives’, ‘radicals’ and ‘reformers’...are therefore of doubtful validity. Just as western influences did not lead to ‘progressive’ social and political consciousness, traditional influences did not invariably create conservative attitudes’. [K M Panikkar, *Culture, Ideology, Hegemony* (Anthem:1995): 69, 93]

The discursive formations that allowed for this in Wales were contingent and based around particular power/knowledge relations: if one can forgive the unfortunate phrase, national breast-beating seems somewhat misguided given the policing of sexuality that this process involved, and the contingency of those relations. It is rather an indication of the relative strategic discursive positions taken up as positions of authority to speak, and this was to give limited spaces for national and female voices, and the symbolism of the ideal Welsh woman was a vital adjunct to developing cultural nationalism, of asserting ‘inner’ national difference. Gender relations was vital in the assertion of and defence of cultural difference, which Chatterjee describes for colonised societies:

Anticolonial nationalism creates its own domain of sovereignty within colonial society well before it begins its political battle with the imperial power. It does this by dividing the world of social institutions and practice into two domains – the material and the spiritual. The material is the domain of the “outside,” of the economy and of statecraft, of science and technology, a domain where the West had proved its superiority and the East had succumbed. In this domain, then Western superiority had to be acknowledged and replicated. The spiritual, on the other hand, is an “inner” domain bearing the “essential” marks of cultural identity.<sup>131</sup>

Such ‘cultural stuff’ does however have material effects, as it constructs and engenders the identifications of the nation on particular relations of gender, religion and class as well as language.

### **Part 1: Education, Governmentality and Colonialism: Constructing the English and Anglicised Subject**

This section looks at the particular construction of the ‘educable subject’ and how it was translated into colonial education in India, which resulted in its articulation in relation to civility, with ‘English civility’ being the ideal toward which to discipline Indians, and ‘English education’ the means by which it was to be achieved. Processes of making civilised were thus linked to Anglicisation. Due to controversies over religious education and the sensitivities and fears of insecurity it raised, English

---

<sup>131</sup> P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought in the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (Zed Books: 1993), p 6

Literature displaced religion as the means of inculcating moral values upon subjects. This section will first look at the construction of the ‘educable subjects’, before looking at its translation into the Indian context, with particular reference to Thomas Babbington Macaulay’s notorious Minutes on Education.

### **The subject of education**

In his essay ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’, Foucault identifies the reasoning behind Nietzsche’s challenge to the pursuit of ‘origin’: ‘because it is an attempt to capture the exact essence of things, their purest possibilities, and their carefully protected identities...directed to “that which was already there”.’<sup>132</sup> These can all be seen mirrored in the discourse of Education, in their need to construct a subject at once rational and natural, ‘there’ and ‘to be found’, particular and universal, and from a culture but to be cultivated. It is this view of the ambivalent ‘educable’ subject that is vital to the discourse’s construction and the ambivalences from which techniques and asymmetric authorities of power and knowledge are justified. It is this dynamic which leads to the split Anglicised subject as seen in India and Wales.

As Alan Richardson states, the construction of the child as a qualitatively different stage of development is a relatively modern phenomenon that reaches its apex in the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>133</sup>. Laurence Stone points to different viewpoints on childhood, two of which I will discuss here – the “environmentalist” view, associated with Locke, and the “utopian” view associated with Rousseau.<sup>134</sup> Tensions between these discourses of reason and convention, and nature and feeling, point to the problem of the ambivalent subject and subjectivity, and its political and material effects in educational practices. Each implicitly indicate a return to a mythic ‘natural’ source of human behaviour, attained, contradictorily, through cultural practices of education.

Locke’s ‘environmentalist’ view sees the child as a *tabula rasa*. As a ‘blank slate’ the child could be inscribed by society through education. The subject is therefore

---

<sup>132</sup> M Foucault, ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’ in P Rabinow (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault vol 2: Aesthetics* (Penguin: 1994), p 271

<sup>133</sup> A Richardson, *Literature, Education and Romanticism* (Cambridge: 1994), p 8-9

<sup>134</sup> L Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson: 1977), p 406

environmentally created – knowledge is acquired through experience by (outer) ‘sensation’ and (inner) ‘reflection’.<sup>135</sup> Ideas were created by language’s conventional nature. Culture and civilisation are therefore important in the construction of knowledge and the cultivation of reason which is nonetheless already present (or is to be uncovered) in the subject. Conversely, unreason can be explained by barbarity and *a* savage culture, and this movement from *a* rational ego to *a* unitary culture is significant in indicating that liberal thought here constructs the ideal of ‘an individual’ or ‘a society’ as objects of its discourse (which are easily substitutable, and slide into one another). Socialisation therefore requires the inculcation of reason into the subject and its consequent repetition and perfectibility of the individual’s (and so indirectly society’s) innate ‘reasonableness’.

Conventionalism and development could justify colonisation on a rational basis. Locke’s view was that the idea of agricultural efficiency allowed the annexing of land on the basis of an increased level of development and efficient use of the land’s resources – a legitimisation that remained well into the nineteenth century.<sup>136</sup> His view of property and civilised man allowed him to see indigenous collectivities as subhuman, and their land therefore legally empty, and so could be colonised.<sup>137</sup> Similarly, socialisation was necessary to teach a child to use its innate human critical faculties (which required an innate civility to be classed as human of course), a view derided by Rousseau.

The ‘utopian’ or romantic view is that the child is innocent and uncorrupted by society and socialisation. Rousseau links the child to his idea of the (pre-social) noble savage.<sup>138</sup> Civil society implies corruption – for Rousseau the savage is immune from the tyranny of reason, that which separates us from nature. As Richardson puts it ‘the child is not simply innocent but is invested with organic principles of growth that can either be fostered or distorted by socialisation’.<sup>139</sup> Against Locke, Rousseau states:

---

<sup>135</sup> *ibid*

<sup>136</sup> D Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge University Press: 2000), p 97

<sup>137</sup> B Parekh, ‘Liberalism and Colonialism: a critique of Locke and Mill’ in B Parekh and J N Pieterse (eds), *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge, Power* (University of Chicago Press: 1999), p 81-98

<sup>138</sup> J-J Rousseau, *Emile* (Heinemann: 1975), p 92

<sup>139</sup> A Richardson, *Literature, Education and Romanticism*, p 11

‘Reason with children’ was Locke’s chief maxim...Of all the human faculties, reason which may be said to be compounded of all the rest develops most slowly and with greatest difficulty. Yet it is reason that people want to use in the development of first principles. A reasonable man is the masterwork of a good education: and we actually pretend to be educating children by means of reason! That is beginning at the end. If children appreciated reason they would not need to be educated.<sup>140</sup>

Derrida points to instabilities in Rousseau’s dichotomies of culture and nature – it is ‘culture or cultivation that must supplement a deficient nature, a deficiency that cannot be anything but an accident or deviation from nature’.<sup>141</sup> This also instils a tragic view of the relation between man and society, and man in culture (‘civilised man’). This view is linked also to the valorisation of the ‘noble savage’, and also with the ‘spirit’ of a particular people. Rousseau thus privileges a sentimentalised and mythic original ‘noble savagery’ but in reality views education in terms of biologicistic development (in the sense of cultivation) in a similar structure to Locke’s. ‘Man’ is still seen in particular social states or cultures – as natural/civilised – and this is the other side of the same coin. Even as Rousseau venerates the stereotypical noble ‘natural’ savage rather than civility his is an attempt to cultivate man’s natural being into society, to lose his alienation from nature.

In both these views the construction of what constitutes ‘childhood’ allows by analogy the infantilisation of certain cultures and languages due to viewpoints upon stages of development. Both theories may lead to different defences of authoritarianism for others – on the basis of universalism and difference but also contain inherent slippages and contradictions. Cultivation is required in both theories, to uncover a ‘natural reason’ in Locke, and nature and reason more tragically related in Rousseau, which nonetheless is similarly developmental in its view of social processes. Both have an idea of the subject in its original state, to be uncovered, but to be done so via social cultivation and education.

As G Procacci notes on the governmentality’s need to educate the poor:

---

<sup>140</sup> J-J Rousseau, 1975, p 38

<sup>141</sup> J Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Johns Hopkins: 1997), p 146

Infantilisation of the poor and valorisation of childhood as a vehicle for socialisation: the two go together as technical supports for an immense enterprise of permanent educability.<sup>142</sup>

It is precisely the ambivalence of valorisation and infantilisation that allows for the work of education to proceed through the human subject who is neither 'here' nor 'there', but there, to be uncovered. It is in the construction of such discourses that one finds the power relations and the constructions of problematics and that which is to be done in order to construct the soul of the citizen.<sup>143</sup> As Gordon puts it of the difference between state theory (à la Marxism) and Foucault is that 'State theory attempts to deduce the modern activities of government from essential properties and propensities of the state, in particular its supposed propensity to grow and to swallow up or colonise everything outside itself'.<sup>144</sup> For Foucault, the State has no essential properties or essence: 'The nature of the institution of the state is, Foucault thinks, a function of changes in practices of government, rather than the converse.'<sup>145</sup> Problematics and calculations of what is possible and probable do not merely emerge top-down from the state, but are discursively constructed in social practices. As such the 'educable subject' emerges in this social discourse, a product of it, rather than an ego or subjectivity outside it to be discovered, or a false one imposed and created by the state. As Foucault states of Governmentality:

The population now represents more the end of government than the power of the sovereign; the population is the subject of needs, of aspirations, but it is also the object in the hands of government...Interest as the consciousness of each individual which makes up the population, and interest considered as the interest of the population regardless of what the particular interest and aspirations of the individuals who compose it: this is the new target and the fundamental interest of the government of population. This is the birth of a new art, or at any rate a range of absolutely new tactics and techniques.<sup>146</sup>

However, it is important that this discursive formation of 'education' also constructs its own institutional identity and for Pierre Bourdieu 'modifies the content and the spirit of the culture it transmits and above all, that its express function is to transform

---

<sup>142</sup> G Procacci, 'Social Economy and the Government of Poverty' in C Gordon (ed), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: 1991), p 166

<sup>143</sup> C Gordon, 'Governmental Rationality: An Introduction' in C Gordon (ed) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: 1991), p 4

<sup>144</sup> *ibid*

<sup>145</sup> *ibid*

<sup>146</sup> M Foucault, 'Governmentality' in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994), p 217

the collective heritage into a common individual consciousness'.<sup>147</sup> It is important to note how and why this process becomes one of Anglicisation and of a formation named '*English Education*'. As will be seen, this is done through the curriculum that introduces English and English literature as important subjects and for particular reasons (often different in different contexts). In India, this is firstly done because of the British administration's aims of religious neutrality on the basis of security (not stirring up trouble), but has the effect of displacing Christian education as moral education. Such a construction emerges however as a hybrid, with influences of Indian pedagogy, and a negotiation of position which is then imported to Britain and applied and practiced as '*English Education*'. It is to this process that we now turn.

### Colonial Discourse and Education in India

The importance of Macaulay's Minutes on Education (1835) as a colonial document is difficult to overestimate. Its sheer notoriety stems from the quite naked and bold judgement of Indian civilisation as deficient in comparison to the English. This section will analyse this document, and will outline its important themes in relation to the 1847 Report in Wales, in particular in the formation of its 'native' subject, its viewpoint of civilisation constructed as 'universal' but was in fact particular, and in the role of English education as a panacea to the ills of, or to the interests and needs attributed to the respective societies analysed. This is also linked to Macaulay's pragmatic view of a limited art of governance, in accordance to Foucault's view of the liberal governmentality.

It is important to note that this document is not merely the work of an exploitative colonialist out for glory and gain and of conscious oppression, although given its premises and prejudices it is easy to interpret it so. An analysis of 'guilty men' does not give an understanding of how their position of authority is maintained and based around power and knowledge relations, nor does it tell us how they can say what they say and speak for subjects. Macaulay was basing his arguments on power relations and discourses of education and Anglicisation which were already invested into the

---

<sup>147</sup> P Bourdieu, 'Systems of Education and Systems of Thought', in F D Young, *Knowledge and Control* (London: 1971), p 194

Indian context. The Burdwan plan of the Church Missionary School of 1818 anticipates Macaulay's statement above almost to the word: 'to form a body of well instructed labourers, competent in their proficiency in English to act as Teachers, Translators, and Compilers of useful works for the masses of the people'.<sup>148</sup> This also indicates the multiple levels in governmentality, not simply top-down from a central state essence, but also including a network of interests and voluntary groups, blurring the distinction between state and society.

In this sense the discourse spoke through Macaulay rather than being a result of his authorship, and his use of other 'experts' (such as James Mill's *History of India*) was a means of asserting authority of knowledge, but indicate the intertextual basis of that authority from a position of English cultural mastery. It is important to note also, as with many of the main champions of intervention in India at this period, Macaulay was a radical and progressive. For liberals such as the utilitarians, India was a blank slate upon which to test their theories.<sup>149</sup> Discourses of English education were being constructed in India but this was also an issue – a solution to a perceived problem – for governance. For Eric Stokes, Macaulay's minutes indicate attempts to project the school monitoring - the 'Madras' system - on to a national level in India.<sup>150</sup>

The starting point of the Minutes are on the interpretation of the 1813 Renewal of the East India Company's Charter, which placed public money for education in India, 'for the revival and promotion of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction and promotion of knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories'. Macaulay's key point of contention is on the following basis:

It does not appear to me that the Act of Parliament can, by any art of construction, be made to bear the meaning which has been assigned to it. It contains nothing about the particular languages or sciences which are to be studied.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> cited in H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 106

<sup>149</sup> E Stokes, *The English Utilitarians in India* (OUP India: 1989)

<sup>150</sup> *ibid*

<sup>151</sup> T B Macaulay, 'Minute on Indian Education', in G M Young (ed) *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952), p 719



Here, Macaulay is contending with the ‘vernacularist’ view of Indian education that holds that it should be conducted in the Indian languages. Macaulay himself is quite clearly in the opposite, ‘Anglicist’ camp. He argues against the vernacularist interpretation by necessarily refuting Indian knowledge as it appears in Arabic or Sanskrit:

It is argued, or rather taken for granted, that by literature, the Parliament can have meant only Arabic or Sanscrit [*sic*] literature, that they would never have given the honorable appellation of “a learned native” to a nation who was familiar with the poetry of Milton, the Metaphysics of Locke, and the Physics of Newton; but that they meant to designate by that name only such persons as might have studied in the sacred books of the Hindoos all the uses of cuta-grass, and all the mysteries of absorption into the Deity.<sup>152</sup>

This, indeed, is the crux of the matter. In Macaulay’s view, the Orientalist view of different knowledge places the Indian as inferior, whereas his view sees them as capable of attaining Universalist rationality, synonymous with English learning. It is this construction of ‘universal English-ness’ which we can identify as being particular: as ‘anglicisation’. Later, he repeats the charge against a view of the Indian as different, as lesser - ‘It is taken for granted by the advocates of Oriental learning, that no native of this country can possibly attain more than a mere smattering of English’.<sup>153</sup> He thus attributes the need of the native to this (apparently) universal figure of the English gentleman, and bases his argument on the equality of individuals, but only within the relative development and universality of cultures – with particular culture more suited to a universal(ised) view of ‘man’ than others.

At this point he makes the striking admission on the languages he is to pass judgement upon – ‘I have no knowledge of either Sanscrit or Arabic’. So he claims to have read translations and defers to experts in the field, from whom: ‘I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia’.<sup>154</sup> It therefore becomes clear which language is to be used:

How then stands the case? We have to educate a people who cannot at present be educated by means of their mother-tongue. We must reach them by some

---

<sup>152</sup> Macaulay, ‘Minutes on Indian Education’, p 719

<sup>153</sup> *ibid*, p 728-9

<sup>154</sup> *ibid*, p 722

foreign language. The claims of our language *it is hardly necessary to recapitulate.*<sup>155</sup> [My emphasis]

This clearly illustrates the level of common-sense notions of English superiority. He elaborates: ‘It may safely be said, that the literature now extant in that language is of far greater value than all the literature which three hundred years ago was extant in all the world put together.’<sup>156</sup>

Consequently, ‘the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects’.<sup>157</sup> To this construction of English culture, and therefore language, he strongly contrasts the claims of Arabic and Sanskrit, as these languages, ‘whenever they differ from those of Europe, differ for the worse’. Such a zealous denunciation is required in order for the case of English education to be made, because it does not rest simply on learning, but on the whole civilising process dependent on the relative of development of different cultures. His claim to knowledge is based on the experts of India, such as James Mill, on an English canon of ‘scientific’ knowledge. It is this authority of knowledge which allows him to argue his case from a position, within English culture, of authority over others and to speak for the wants and needs of Indian subjects.

He points to the unequal relation between the English and the Indian by pointing to the teacher/pupil analogy, which discredits the use of Sanskrit, and places Indian in its relative position to English:

I can by no means admit that when a nation of high intellectual attainments undertakes to superintend the education of a nation comparatively ignorant, the learners are absolutely to prescribe the course which is to be taken by the teachers.<sup>158</sup>

This indicates precisely the way in which ideas of development, of cultivation into culture, of teacher/pupil relations and the socialisation into a master culture, link the discourses of education and colonialism.

The corollary of all this is summed up by Macaulay thus:

---

<sup>155</sup> *ibid*

<sup>156</sup> *ibid*, p 723

<sup>157</sup> *ibid*

<sup>158</sup> *ibid*, p 725

it is impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people. We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.<sup>159</sup>

The disciplining of the native subject is clear, in order to arrive at the *telos* of English civility, to create a ‘mimic man’, and anglicised Indian subject. Nevertheless, it does allow that this class of translators *can* transmit these moral values into the ‘vernacular’ languages. In this sense, as we shall see, the 1847 Report on the State of Education in Wales is a more explicitly Anglicist document than Macaulay’s minutes.<sup>160</sup>

However, this passage, following the brash confidence of what has been said before, seems rather timid in its aims. Oddly, it seems as if education is used to ‘pass the buck’ from government and to attempt to avoid too much involvement. Education becomes the easiest means of assimilation that would lead to a class of translators who would take up the mantle of civility. However, Foucault’s notion of governmentality, where it is civil society that constitutes the object of governmental intervention, surveillance and discipline, but only so as ‘not to impede the course of things, but to ensure the play of natural and necessary modes of regulation, to make regulations which permit natural regulation to operate.’<sup>161</sup> From this, morality and civility occur naturally from the innate rationality and self-interest (both intertwined) of individuals freed from the traps of their own culture. As Graham Burchell puts it on this *laissez-faire* art of governance:

Government by *laissez-faire* is a government of interests, a government which works through and with interests, both those of individuals and, increasingly, those attributed to the population itself. It is a government which depends upon the conduct of *individuals* who are parts of a population and subjects of particular, personal interests...This individual living being, the subject of particular interests, represents a new figure of social and political subjectivity,

---

<sup>159</sup> *ibid*, p 729

<sup>160</sup> M A Laird, *Missionaries and Education in Bengal 1793-1837* (Oxford: 1972) p 14

<sup>161</sup> quoted in C Gordon, ‘Governmental Rationality’, p 17

the prototype of 'economic man', who will become the correlate and instrument of a new art of government.<sup>162</sup>

It is vitally important to note here therefore, the *moral* element which English education can and is seen by government (although not in itself seen as sufficient in this regard by missionaries of course) to supply, which then displaces religious education as moral education as such, and is that which provides security:

secularism is less a rejection of an earlier pedagogical approach stressing the identification of literature with religious value than a secular reinscription of ideas of truth, knowledge, and law derived from the sacred plane. The effect is the gradual removal of religion and traditional religious explanations from one sphere of knowledge after another...and ultimately the confinement of religion to matters of religious faith alone, excluding even morals.<sup>163</sup>

It is this sacralisation of 'useful' English knowledge which will be used to justify *Anglicising* the natives, and will be reimported back to Wales in this disciplinary function of working on individuals' morality, or rather individuals in particular groups of class, gender and language.

The ambivalence of this discourse can be seen in Macaulay's answer of educating as universal in relation to the problem of reforming the native where the discourse of 'European humanism is capable only of ironizing itself' by creating a 'mimic man'<sup>164</sup>. To Bhabha this is the 'effect of a flawed mimesis, in which to be Anglicised is *emphatically* not to be English.'<sup>165</sup> This, further, can be linked to the identarian view of education that is linked to English language and literature. For Viswanathan:

The affirmation of an ideal self and an ideal political state through a specific national literature – English literature – is in essence an affirmation of English identity. But that identity is equally split along the lines of actual and ideal selves...disciplinary management of natives blends into the rarefied, more exalted image of the Englishman as *producer* of his own knowledge that empowers him to conquer, appropriate and manage in the first place...In a parodic reworking of the Cartesian axiom, the Englishman's true essence is defined by the thought he produces, overriding all other aspects of his identity – his personality, actions and behaviour. His material reality as subjugator and

---

<sup>162</sup> G Burchell, 'Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and governing 'the system of natural liberty'', in C Gordon, *The Foucault Effect*, p 127

<sup>163</sup> G Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (Oxford: 1989), p 95

<sup>164</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 87

<sup>165</sup> *ibid*

alien ruler is dissolved in his mental output; the blurring of the man and his works effectively removes him from history.<sup>166</sup>

In this sense, the universal ‘civilised’ man is linked with Anglicisation, but is done so by constructing a position in which at the centre there is a lack and ambivalence – there is no ‘Englishman’ as such. In this way it is possible to place in this identity the morality, useful and objective knowledge, and progress under the rubric of Anglicisation. Governmental rationality is thus Anglicised, and imbued with identity.

Macaulay points to the glory of such a project in which he states of the ‘growth’, speaking organically that ‘the public mind of India may expand...till it has outgrown that system’, of civilisation and a native demand for European institutions:

Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own.<sup>167</sup>

The native is therefore fully deserving of selfless tutelage of Anglicisation, which is now presented also as ‘benign, disinterested, detached, impartial and judicious’<sup>168</sup>. The basis of the reform is therefore of morals, civility and knowledge.

The problem of Macaulay’s discourse is therefore not simply positing the similarity and universality of the Indian native in their presumed ability to be educated via ‘universal’ English learning. Nor does the problem lie in absolute difference or particularity, in the Indian’s naturalised difference – or deficiency - in the art of government, and his need for English leadership. Rather, its power lies in the tension and slippage between the two. The native is capable of learning (on the basis of *becoming* the universal English learned gentleman) but must therefore be inferior already (on the basis of a difference in the level of civility on what Mill calls the ‘scale of civilisation’). One finds here the same split subject as in Rousseau and Locke’s view of man and education, in terms of what s/he is and is to be, with the same seemingly rational and natural subject posited as an origin yet needing to be

---

<sup>166</sup> G Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest*, p 20

<sup>167</sup> T B Macaulay, *Speech on Government in India 1833*, in G M Young (ed) *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952), p 718

<sup>168</sup> G Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest*, p 108

uncovered, but is in fact constructed through this very discourse of education. Liberal universality and *tabula rasa* view depends on hierarchy and a particular cultural education to develop to that universal civility.

## ***Part 2: The Impact in Wales: The 1847 Report***

In modern education, ‘the destined object of these educative techniques is not the child alone’ – it is to teach the populace from infancy to have civil habits for later.<sup>169</sup> Ian Hunter sees the school as working on ‘statistical profiles of dangerous and endangered populations’ with the ‘disciplinary technology of the school itself, improvised as a means of moral management’.<sup>170</sup> This is not worked from the state simply as a top-down process, as the state cannot ‘simply whistle the means of moral training into existence’.<sup>171</sup> The state utilises what is already there, in the voluntary schools system. In Wales, the report also draws upon the authorised moral value of English Education as constructed in India. It thus contributes a ‘space of ethical formation...under the continuous ethical supervision and problematisation of a teacher who embodies both moral authority and pastoral care’.<sup>172</sup> This will be important when we look at Welsh nonconformists who rail against the imposition of the state into their moral disciplinary sphere as such figures of authority and pastoral care.

This can be seen perfectly in the first half of the nineteenth century in Wales, as the increase in schools occurs in the competition in the voluntary sector between the Anglican ‘National Schools’ and the Dissenting ‘British Schools’. In each of these, the aim is at security by socialising the lowest classes in society, and not at imparting knowledge which was seen as dangerous. Andrew Bell who developed the monitorial system of education was only one of many who saw teaching to read and ‘cipher’ as carrying ‘a risk of elevating...the minds of those doomed to the drudgery of daily

---

<sup>169</sup> G Procacci, ‘Social Economy and the Government of Poverty’, p 166

<sup>170</sup> I Hunter, ‘Assembling the School’ in A Barry, T Osborne, N Rose, *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (Routledge: 1996), p 143

<sup>171</sup> *ibid*, p 149

<sup>172</sup> *ibid*, p 160

labour above their condition, and thereby rendering them discontented in their lot.’<sup>173</sup>  
The rationale for education is found elsewhere to learning as such.

While education was voluntary rather than state education in England and Wales in the nineteenth century, it is important to note the increasing role of the state in surveying, inspecting and reporting on education. This was generally accepted even by the opponents of state provision which did not happen finally until 1870 and the Elementary Education Act. Nevertheless, the state’s increased monitoring involvement meant that its reports and inspectors set the terms of debate toward the mid-century. Indeed the 1847 Report on the State of Education in Wales is a testament to this process.

James Kay-Shuttleworth, the Chair of Committee of Council on Education, and compiler of the brief for the 1847 Report on the State of Education in Wales is representative of the discourse on education in this period. Kay-Shuttleworth linked education to security and an empiricist investigation of society, having studied the dangers of the ignorance of the masses in the 1830s:

Kay-Shuttleworth’s “perception” of Manchester’s social problems, and of State education as their corrective instrument, was formed through the statistical correlations linking the poverty, criminality, morbidity, alcoholism and immorality of Manchester’s working classes to their “ignorance” or illiteracy<sup>174</sup>

As Ian Hunter puts it of the statistical data required in such reports:

the role of social statistics is not so much to represent reality as to problematise it: to call it into question; to hold it up for inspection in the light of what it might be; to picture its reconstruction around certain norms of life and social well-being<sup>175</sup>

Macaulay reiterated his views on education for the domestic context, neatly for us, in 1847. His use of pronouns clearly illustrate for whom such a development was meant to create security:

---

<sup>173</sup> cited in G Tyson Roberts, *Language of the Blue Books*, p 131-2; Andrew Bell initially set up a system in the 1890s in Madras whereby students would oversee one another according to ability, which was a means of efficiently systematising the classroom into hierarchised monitors, which meant that one teacher could oversee a larger amount of pupils. It was then incorporated in British schools.

<sup>174</sup> Ian Hunter, ‘Assembling the School’, p 154

<sup>175</sup> *ibid*

It is the duty of government to protect *our* persons and property. The gross ignorance of the common peoples is a principal cause of danger to *our* persons and property<sup>176</sup> [my emphasis]

Echoing William Williams's rhetoric of politics as war by other means, he uses the example of 'the military calling', and calls for treating schoolmasters of the poor like soldiers.<sup>177</sup> The motion for the commission is within a wider discourse of education, surveillance and security, and also very similar to Macaulay's Minutes in linking education with security and the construction of rational individuals acting in their rational interest (rather than Chartist 'passions' linked with ignorance). This is the context within which the report emerges.

Because of the way education could not be separated from ideals of civility and security, the report was inevitably far more general than a strict inspection of schools. As in Macaulay's Minutes on education in India, one finds a similar assignation of Welsh subjectivity and character in dismissal of literature, economic position and their moral character. Again, we see that English education, as moulded in India, is moral education, that carries with it useful knowledge and civility. This education is to socialise and discipline the individual as a blank slate, or to bring out his rationality through the supplement of a culture that is portrayed as universal but is in fact a particular construction of English Education as developed in India.

### **The Report on the State of Education in Wales**

The cover of the Report illustrates instantly what are the aims of the report, and the presumptions that underline it:

in pursuance of Proceedings in the House of Commons, on the Motion of Mr Williams, of March 10, 1846, for an address to the Queen, praying Her Majesty to direct an Inquiry to be made into the State of Education in the Principality of Wales, and especially into the means afforded to the Labouring Classes of acquiring a Knowledge of the English Language.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> T B Macaulay, 'Speech on Education' in G M Young (ed), *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952), p 779-81

<sup>177</sup> *ibid*, p 787

<sup>178</sup> *Report on the State of Education in Wales*, 1847, p i



The motion alluded to is by William Williams MP with whom this chapter opened. The cover already illustrates the assertion of difference, and on which terms. The notion of education, and with it the underlying ideas of socialisation, of the labouring classes in Wales, is clearly linked with the English language.

The Commissioners for the inquiry were all English, upper-middle class lawyers, Anglicans, with no prior experience of education and no facility with the Welsh language. Ralph Robert Wheeler Lingen was born in 1819, and took a degree in Classics at Trinity College, Oxford, and called to the Bar in 1847.<sup>179</sup> He would replace Kay-Shuttleworth as Secretary to the Committee of Council on Education in 1849, and continued his successful career, becoming Secretary to the Treasury in 1870, honoured with a KCB in 1878 and appointed to the House of Lords in 1885.<sup>180</sup> He died in 1905. Lingen examined the counties of Carmarthen, Glamorgan and Pembrokeshire. Jelinger Cookson Symons (1809-60) was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, called to the Bar in 1843, and became a HM Inspector of Schools in 1848.<sup>181</sup> Symons examined Brecknock, Cardiganshire, Radnorshire and Monmouthshire. Henry Vaughan Johnson was educated in Trinity College Cambridge, graduating in 1846, and was called to the Bar in 1848, and later appointed secretary to his father-in-law Lord Chancellor Campbell.<sup>182</sup> Johnson examined the North Wales counties. The Commissioners were to take up the role of objective experts – as the instructions stated they were to limit the report ‘to the facts which you will have ascertained’. As Gwyneth Tyson Roberts states:

On the surface, this was a reminder of the need for thoroughness; at a deeper level it assumed that Commissioners were fully equipped to judge the completeness and accuracy of the facts they collected in a country whose linguistic, social, cultural and religious history were foreign to them. The Commissioners not unnaturally shared this flattering assessment of their own abilities and authoritative objectivity.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> Frank Price Jones, ‘The Blue Books of 1847’ in J C Williams and G R Hughes, *The History of Education in Wales I* (Christopher Davies: 1978), p 134

<sup>180</sup> *ibid*

<sup>181</sup> *ibid*

<sup>182</sup> *ibid*

<sup>183</sup> G Tyson Roberts, *Language of the Blue Books*, p 77

However, as in Macaulay's minutes, 'while it is self-confidently making the claim to objectivity which is a major property of official discourse, it is simultaneously undermining this claim at several different levels.'<sup>184</sup>

James Kay-Shuttleworth, whom we have already seen as representative of his age's empirical and statistical zeal in educational inspections, wrote instructions to the commissioners of the inquiry. These were subsequently printed in local journals and newspapers and frame the parameters of the report.<sup>185</sup> The asserted and assumed scientific authority of the report can be seen in Kay-Shuttleworth's description of the 'nature and objects' of the Inquiry in Wales:

The object of your commission is, to ascertain, as accurately as circumstances will permit, the existing number of schools of all descriptions, for the education of the children of the labouring classes, or of adults – the amount of attendance – the ages of the scholars – and the character of the instruction given in the schools; in order that Her Majesty's government and Parliament may be enabled, by having these facts before them, in connexion with the wants and circumstances of the population of the principality, to consider what measures ought to be taken for the improvement of the existing means of education in Wales.<sup>186</sup>

This passage indicates the object of inquiry as the schools themselves as a means of socialising the population, but also connects them to the 'wants and needs' attributed to the population. The scope of the inquiry is thus indicated as being far wider than education, requiring also the attribution of needs to this society. This is further indicated in this passage:

You will also be enabled to form some estimate of the general state of intelligence and information of the poorer classes in Wales, and of the influence which an improved education might be expected to produce, on the general condition of society, and its moral and religious progress.<sup>187</sup>

This indicates a need to understand the level of civilisation of Wales, on the model of a scale of development and cultivation analysed in the first two sections of this chapter. As will be seen, and as is suggested with the importance given to English in William Williams's motion, this is implicitly done in comparison with – and in

---

<sup>184</sup> *ibid*, p 234

<sup>185</sup> J Symons, *Report on the State of Education in Wales: Part II: The counties of Brecknock, Cardigan and Radnor*, p 2 – henceforth referenced as 'Report II'

<sup>186</sup> *Report on the State of education in Wales: Instruction*, p iii

<sup>187</sup> *ibid*

contrast to - English civility and morals, the value of which we have seen in 'English Education'.

As in Macaulay, all the commissioners point to the Welsh character as not exhibiting rational faculties. Lingen points to how the Welsh are of two types: farmers 'rude and primitive agriculturalists, living poorly' and 'smelters and miners, wantoning in plenty'.<sup>188</sup> It is the Welsh language that makes the Welshman unable to develop with industry:

in his new, as in his old, home, his language keeps him under the hatches, being one in which he can neither acquire nor communicate the necessary information. It is a language of old-fashioned agriculture, and of simple rustic life, while all the world about him is English.<sup>189</sup>

As in Macaulay then, there is a need to contrast the 'traditional', rustic Welsh to the industrious, dynamic English, although the industrious English referred to here are unlikely to be 'wanton' miners in England.

In order to illustrate Welsh civilisation as of a 'lesser' order, the commissioners, as in India, illustrate the deficiencies of its literature. Here, they argue that Welsh literature has very little in the fields of useful knowledge, and that it is mired in pointless religious polemics. The literature of the Welsh is used by Symons to 'prove' his most infamous comment:

The Welsh language is a vast drawback to Wales, and a manifold barrier to the moral progress and commercial prosperity of its people. It is not easy to over-estimate its evil effects. It is the language of the Cymri, and anterior to that of the ancient Britons. It dissevers the people from intercourse that would help advance their civilisation, and bars the access of improving knowledge to their minds. *As proof of this, there is no Welsh literature worthy of the name.*<sup>190</sup>

Johnson similarly states 'The impress of this imperfect civilisation is also seen in the literature.'<sup>191</sup> In the appendix, his assistant, John James, similarly dismisses the

---

<sup>188</sup> R Lingen, *Report on the State of Education in Wales: part I; The Counties of Carmarthen, Glanorgan and Pembroke*, henceforth referenced as 'Report I', p 2

<sup>189</sup> *ibid*, p 3

<sup>190</sup> 'Report II', p 66

<sup>191</sup> H V Johnson, *Report on the State of education in Wales: part III; North Wales*, henceforth referenced as 'Report III', p 59

relevance, or public good of the Eisteddfod, as well as the Cymreigyddion Society.<sup>192</sup> The commissioners here, like Macaulay, feel themselves able to judge on a foreign literature from a position of objectivity. Welsh literature is seen to propagate materials of limited public good or utility, and so ‘confirming a natural partiality for polemics, which impedes the cultivation of a higher and more comprehensive taste and desire for general information’ – general, here, of course, signifying ‘English’.<sup>193</sup>

Dissenting religious ideas are also linked to ‘polemics’, suggesting that it is inimical to order and morality proper to the real world. The implication here is that ‘useful knowledge’ under English Education would also provide a moral education based on order, rather than the implied danger of Dissenting education’s vagueness and lack of enforcement of moral duties. The identity and impress of this English Education is seen in the following quotation by Lingen:

I have no hesitation in saying that a child may pass through the generality of these schools without learning either the limits, capabilities, general history, or language of that empire in which he is born a citizen, and this is the kind of knowledge which I consider to be the province of Geography, English History, English Grammar, and English Etymology in elementary schools.<sup>194</sup>

We can see the displacement of Christianity here by ‘useful’ secular knowledge as ‘English Education’ as a process placed in a different context but with clear parallels with its formation as a discursive formation in India. However, what is ‘useful’ has been constructed precisely by the process of this displacement in India. It is thus that ‘useful (English) knowledge’ (and its link to morality, civility and enterprise) becomes reified and sacralised as good in itself to become the panacea to all Wales’s perceived ills. Significantly as well as geography and history (both of course imperial subjects themselves), English grammar and etymology are given prominence. This process also illustrates the process of governmentalisation of the previously religious sphere of pastoral care, eventually to its exclusion from moral education.

Given that such English Education carries moral value in socialising and civilising, it is necessary too that it is at the level of morality where Wales is seen to fail, but also how they are deserving of such education. Lingen states that to the Welsh, the phrase

---

<sup>192</sup> *ibid*, p 322-3

<sup>193</sup> *ibid*

<sup>194</sup> Report I, p 28

‘good character’ refers to ‘an absence of legal rather than moral offences’<sup>195</sup>, often linked to a lack of participation in illegality such as the Rebecca Riots. While admitting some civilising effects of this religiosity he also points to its danger and incompleteness:

Most singular is the character which has been developed by this theological bent of minds isolated from nearly all sources, direct or indirect, of secular information. Poetical and enthusiastic warmth of religious feeling, careful attendance upon religious services, zealous interest in religious knowledge, the comparative absence of crime, are found side by side with the most unreasoning prejudices or impulses; an utter want of method in thinking and acting; and (what is far worse), with a wide-spread disregard of temperance, whenever there are the means of excess, of chastity, of veracity, and of fair dealing.<sup>196</sup>

Symons views the problem in a similar fashion:

The evidence given me of the immoral character of the people, with a few exceptions, tells the same tale. The Welsh are peculiarly exempt from the guilt of great crimes. There are few districts in Europe where murders, burglaries, personal violence, rapes, forgeries, or any felonies on a large scale, are so rare. On the other hand, there are, perhaps, few countries where the standard of minor morals is lower. Petty thefts, lying, cozening, every species of chicanery, drunkenness (where the means exist), and idleness prevail to a great extent among the least educated part of the community, who scarcely regard them in the light of sins.<sup>197</sup>

Johnson similarly asserts they are free from ‘heinous crimes’, and no sedition exists in his districts, with the exception of areas in Montgomeryshire of a ‘profane and seditious character’, where writings of Paine, Volney, and Owen circulated.<sup>198</sup> The authority of self-proclaimed objectivity and expertise is vital in asserting this lack of morality - it is difficult to measure after all – and these statements could be expected by the commissioners and their perceived audience to carry authority in imparting knowledge as the ‘facts ascertained’.

Most significantly, morality is analysed by reference to gender and lack of chastity in Welsh women. Here, clearly, women are seen as the (failed) moral guardians of the Welsh as a people, and in the reproduction of tradition and moral failings:

---

<sup>195</sup> Report I, p 394

<sup>196</sup> Report I, p 6

<sup>197</sup> Report II, p 56

<sup>198</sup> Report III, p 67

There is another very painful feature in the laxity of morals, voluntarily attested by some of those who have given evidence. I refer to the alleged want of chastity in the women. If this be so, it is sufficient to account for all other immoralities, for each generation will derive its moral tone in a great degree from the influences imparted by the mothers who reared them.<sup>199</sup>

Johnson also sees this particular vice, of the lack of chastity among Welsh women, is particularly noteworthy to the Welsh

But there is one vice flagrant throughout North Wales, and remains unchecked by any instrument of civilisation. It has obtained for so long a time as the peculiar vice of the principality, that its existence has almost ceased to be considered an evil; and the custom of Wales is said to justify the barbarous practices which precede the rite of marriage.<sup>200</sup>

Indeed, for Symons, this is noteworthy of the Welsh beyond the lower classes:

Natural modesty is utterly suppressed by this vile practice, and the instinctive delicacy alike in men and women is destroyed in its very germ. These practices obtain in the classes immediately above as well as among the labouring people<sup>201</sup>

This is an assertion of difference in conduct, which is also linked to the policing and discipline of sexuality and the home in nineteenth century thought. Symons is here particularly interesting in naturalising those codes, as the ‘natural modesty’ and ‘instinctive delicacy’. Civilised society is naturalised, with its ‘natural’ processes and conduct regulated by culture; a perfect example of Foucault’s view of surveillance and discipline as constructing the very idea of ‘human’ onto its subject. Contradictorily, ‘natural’ modesty can only be achieved by socialisation as a supplement to what must be a deficient ‘nature’. Such slippage allows (English) culture to represent itself also as ‘natural’ in regulating its subjects to be ‘naturally modest’. Such ambivalences allow it to have its cake and eat it – being both ‘naturally’ superior and more ‘cultured’ is the twofold and ambivalent identification basis of authority to knowledge and for English Education.

From the moral imperfections and the particularly imaginative and passionate tendencies of the Welsh we see the figure of danger and a need for *intervention*:

---

<sup>199</sup> *ibid*, p 57

<sup>200</sup> Report III, p 67

<sup>201</sup> Report II, p 57

His superiors are content, for the most part, simply to ignore his existence in all its moral relations. He is left to live in an under-world of his own, and the march of society goes so completely over his head, that he is never heard of, excepting when the strange and abnormal features of a Revival, or a Rebecca or Chartist outbreak, call attention to a phase of society which could produce anything so contrary to all that we elsewhere experience.<sup>202</sup>

In this sense, it is quite possible for the poor Welsh to be duped by bad influences, because of the ‘vividly descriptive and imaginative powers of the Welsh, and of the peculiar forms under which popular excitement among them would be sure to exhibit itself’.<sup>203</sup> The iron works, being ‘more isolated from the casual influences of civilisation’ was where the Chartist leader ‘(John) Frost found his followers’.<sup>204</sup> The fact that these outbreaks can thus be linked to the imagination, ignorance and the passions regulate them as deviant and so apolitical. However, it also makes these dangers a place of intervention, socialisation and cultivation, and it can be inferred that the Welsh upper echelons have not done this. For Symons, likewise, ‘it is much to be feared that there are more Samaritans among the poor than among the rich in these counties’<sup>205</sup>, and there is clear self-interest in educating the masses to be rational:

I cannot but regard the condition of the people as one pregnant with grave peril to the interests of society. The Welsh are not prone to sedition; on the contrary, they are very loyally and peaceably disposed, but their passions are easily excited, and their ignorance renders that excitability peculiarly hazardous. ...These various circumstances render it, in my humble opinion, peculiarly impolitic and dangerous that the Welsh people should remain without efficient mental and moral education.<sup>206</sup>

It is also important that this is not only governed by self-interest but also in the interest of a people deserving of such tutelage. Such intervention would liberate the Welshman from his isolation and emancipate his natural faculties:

It is true that the necessities of the world more and more force English upon the Welshman; but, whether he can speak no English, or whether he speaks it imperfectly, he finds it alike painful to be reminded of his utter, or to struggle against his partial, inability of expression. His feelings are impetuous; his imagination vivid; his ideas (on such topics as he entertains) succeed each other rapidly. Hence he is naturally voluble, often eloquent...in speaking

---

<sup>202</sup> Report I, p 3

<sup>203</sup> *ibid*, p 6

<sup>204</sup> *ibid*, p 13

<sup>205</sup> Report II, p 52

<sup>206</sup> *ibid*, p 65

English, he has at once to forego the conscious power of displaying certain talents...he sometimes eagerly banishes it [English] as an irksome imposition.<sup>207</sup>

Again, because of his own particularly closed culture, the Welsh individual cannot see his rational and moral self-interest – ironically, this moral rational individualism can only be taught by socialisation into another culture under English Education. This particular education is assumed as universal.

Nevertheless, one can see in the response by Welsh commentators similar moral underpinnings to that of the report itself, illustrating ‘English’ ideals of culture, civility and education translated to a different context, in what Gwyn Alf Williams sees as English bourgeois values ‘translated and transmuted’ to Wales. Although there is undoubted truth in Williams’s view, it should be remembered that, as Walter Benjamin notes of translation, ‘the transfer can never be total’, and it can only produce ‘in it the echo of the original.’<sup>208</sup> It is also, therefore an assertion of difference, and in this case a process of discipline that is also a means of bringing the population under control and into modernity. We shall now turn to the response to the Report in Wales, and how this discourse of civility and education was translated to these respondents, with significant effects for the discourse of cultural nationalism for the rest of the century.

### Part 3: The Response in Wales and Pastoral Power

This section will analyse the response to the report and how it constructed a particular self-identity of Welshness, allied to ideas of civility, morality, education and based on the authority of the commentators to speak for Wales. However, it will be seen that this construction was not simply oppositional, or an attack from ‘outside’ the colonial discourse, but in fact operated within the terms of that discourse itself. It thus illustrates an encounter with the Anglicising governmentalising rationality of the educational discourse, with its emphasis on useful knowledge, morality, civility and economic interest, all under the rubric of Anglicisation, as constructed from disparate elements in India. The ‘counter-construction’ of Welsh cultural nationalism operates

---

<sup>207</sup> Report I, p 6-7

<sup>208</sup> W Benjamin, *The Task of the Translator* in his *Illuminations* (Pimlico: 1999), p 76-7



within this discourse, complicit even when resistant to it, and constructing its authority under the identity of speaking for and intervening in the population of Wales on the terms of morality and deviancy, religiosity and secularism, and security and disorder as utilised in the report. It does not challenge the terms of debate, only questioning whom is in the best position to analyse Wales most ‘objectively’, and who would best morally educate the Welsh people.

The furore that followed the publication of the Report in December 1847 was indeed a testament to the shock the report caused the Welsh people and press. Satirical cartoons abounded, and the report was most famously satirised – and given its popular name - in R J Derfel’s play *Brad y Llyfrau Gleision* (Treachery of the Blue Books) in 1854, in which Beelzebub sends out the Commissioners to blacken the name of the Welsh.<sup>209</sup> However, this furore itself requires some explanation, particularly as the opinions in the Report were hardly novel. The 1826 report on Anglesey on the ‘problem’ of Welsh speakers stated ‘consequently it must take a long time before they come to a competent knowledge of their duty to God and man’.<sup>210</sup> As noted already, Tremenheere’s report on Monmouthshire (1840) noted the connection between ignorance and Welsh. His later report in 1846 reasserted this view.

One clear explanation for the ferocity of the response is that the above were largely localised events, while the 1847 report was deemed to tarnish the whole nation. Respondents felt compelled to speak for the wronged nation, as they did not for particular localities, especially the mining sectors where, as we shall see, commentators distanced themselves from this troublesome part of the population, dismissing Chartism as English or Anglicised in Wales. While one could possibly ignore the Tremenheere or Anglesey reports as being of a particular district in Wales (while conveying recommendations and arguments that could be applicable in most of Wales), this was clearly a report anticipated for its importance to the vexed issue of education throughout Wales. Naming the report ‘on the state of Education in *Wales*’ indicates a particularly named territory in which to problematise and intervene, a naming which could also allow for a response on that basis to speak ‘for Wales.’

---

<sup>209</sup> R J Derfel, *Brad Y Llyfrau Gleision* (I Clarke:1854)

<sup>210</sup> cited in M A Laird, *Missionaries and Education in Bengal* (Oxford: 1972), p 14

The purview of the 1847 Report was also possibly more to the ‘taste’ of the Welsh nonconformists than others on riots and miners, as they saw themselves as moral teachers of the nation. Education could thus be seen as an ideological battleground for respectable Welsh nonconformists. Moreover, this was done with a particular rival in mind – the Anglican Church. In this tradition it was the Methodists rather than the high-churchmen who had contributed to education, literacy and press in the Welsh language, from the work of Griffith Jones, Llanddowror’s circulating schools in the eighteenth century to Thomas Charles’s Sunday schools and printing press in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.<sup>211</sup> Interestingly, the renowned educationalist and founder of Circulating Schools in Wales – a development which caught the attention of Catherine II in Russia – was offered the chance to be one of the first missionaries to India, an opportunity he rejected in order to focus on Wales.<sup>212</sup>

Indeed, even the work within the early education movement Society of Propagation of Christian Knowledge from 1699 (from which Griffith Jones Llanddowror’s work would evolve) was on the whole fairly supportive of the Welsh language – certainly in North Wales – in complete contrast to its view of Gaelic Scots as ‘the rude speech of a barbarous people and one of the chief causes of the continuance of barbaritie and incivilitie among the inhabitants of the Highlands and Islands’<sup>213</sup>. This can possibly be explained by the fact that four of the five leaders had Welsh connections and that the Welsh response to the initiative was particularly prominent – eight of the first twelve letters emanating from Wales.<sup>214</sup> Education became a Welsh preoccupation and so a site of disciplinary power. It is therefore unsurprising that it was this report that was to evoke the largest response from prominent Welsh figures, as it also constituted a challenge to their own pastoral power of educating the nation. In this sense, the Welsh leaders had a stake in the educational system in that it reflected a form of pastoral power. Churches developed schools independently of the state to Christianise the laity as a form of pastoral power, and thus this institution could be invested with the disciplinary power of English Education. However, the best way to

---

<sup>211</sup> C E Gittins, *Pioneers of Welsh Education* (University College Swansea: 1964)

<sup>212</sup> *Y Bywgraffiadur Cymru hyd 1940* (Cymmrodorion: 1953)

<sup>213</sup> cited in M Clement, ‘Eighteenth Century Charity Schools’ in J C Williams and G R Hughes eds, *The History of Education in Wales I* (Christopher Davies: 1978), p 48

<sup>214</sup> *ibid*, p 46

stop state intervention was to intervene into the population, and to thus be seen as defending against disorder more effectively themselves.

### Constructing Who Speaks for Wales

As Sian Rhiannon Williams states, the opposition to the 1847 Report was a continuation of a struggle for fair education for nonconformists.<sup>215</sup> The main systematic analysis of the 1847 report came from this quarter, with the nonconformist leaders' role as 'directors of the people'.<sup>216</sup> The main opprobrium of the response initially was toward those who had betrayed Wales, the report's informants seen as complicit in the plot against Wales. The inquiry, in their view, 'greatly delighted Churchmen...[it was] an excellent opportunity to get up a case against Dissent'.<sup>217</sup> As Reverend Evan Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd) puts it:

During the last three years, the Welsh people have been much and undeservedly calumniated by English commissioners, the English press, and a few Anglicised Welshmen. Wales, unfortunately, as will be seen from the records of her earliest history, has ever found traitors among her own sons<sup>218</sup>

For Dr Lewis Edwards, Bala, It was 'a mystery to us what enjoyment anyone can get from giving such a false picture of their country and nation' ('mae'n ddirgelwch i ni pa hyfrydwch y mae neb yn gael mewn camddarlunio eu gwlad a cenedl').<sup>219</sup> While he admitted there to be sin in Wales 'the greatest shame of all shames is to raise such men as these' ('y gwarth mwyaf o bob gwarth sydd yn perthyn iddi yw o fagu y fath ddynion a hyn').<sup>220</sup> He compares this situation to the opprobrium in England of O'Connell accusations of English women lack of virtue, but finds it far more 'unnatural' that this accusation should come from 'amongst our own'.<sup>221</sup> These ideas of treachery thus construct and limit the boundaries in who is accepted into and excluded from the Welsh nation. It thus performs an idea of what the Welsh nation is.

---

<sup>215</sup> S R Williams, 'Brad y Tir Du' in Prys Morgan ed *Brad y Llyfrau Gleision* (Gomer: 1991), p 131

<sup>216</sup> *ibid*, p 128

<sup>217</sup> E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *Facts, Figures and Statements in Illustration of the Dissent and Morality of Wales* (B L Green: 1849), p 9-10

<sup>218</sup> *ibid*, p 5

<sup>219</sup> L Edwards, 'Addysg yng Nghymru', from *Detholiad o Draethodau Llenyddol Lewis Edwards* (Hughes: 1992), p 378

<sup>220</sup> *ibid*

<sup>221</sup> *ibid*

It also indicates that it is not the accusation of lack of chastity as such which offends, but who makes the accusation, and to which implied audience.<sup>222</sup>

This preoccupation then turns to the sources and witnesses of the report. For Jane Williams 'Ysgafell', an Anglican with sympathies to nonconformism, most advocates used in the report had a cynical personal interest in furthering the Church 'plan' for state education along Anglican lines – the landowners would save money in not having to provide funds, and the clergy and ministers would similarly save on 'care and toil' for the people.<sup>223</sup> This is clearly seen as an abdication of responsibility and pastoral care. To Williams, the main fault of the Commissioners was in utilising evidence from clearly biased sources. By relying on the 'partial inferences of advocates' she equates this bias with a case of the prosecution 'in the cause of Shuttleworth *versus* Wales', to which she provides a defence.<sup>224</sup> This bias was illustrated by the fact that the respective figures for Churchmen and Dissenters consulted in the report were 232 Churchmen (of whom 159 were Clergy) to 76 Dissenters (of whom 34 were ministers).<sup>225</sup>

Moreover, it is attested that much of the evidence given is worthless, the 'productions of interested, incompetent and immoral witnesses', and that the most important statements of the report have been based on the testimony of such witnesses.<sup>226</sup> Jane Williams points to how the testimony of Churchmen who have had very short residencies as Clergy in Wales, which disqualifies them as competent witnesses, has been preferred over witnesses with more experience, who are so qualified.

In Jane Williams's view, the whole methodology of the Commission is thus fundamentally flawed, and posits an unfair 'ideal of perfection' as the basis of analysing Welsh education.<sup>227</sup> The 'statements of Commissioners are altogether

---

<sup>222</sup> Catrin Stevens has noted the campaigns and accusations of deviant sexual practices in Wales prior to 1847, but as these were made to an implied audience of other Welshmen, they passed without comment – indeed, Ieuan Gwynedd's own views on this were couched in very similar terms to that of the Report when aimed at a Welsh audience. (Catrin Stevens, *Welsh Courting Customs*, p 97-113)

<sup>223</sup> J Williams (Ysgafell), *Artegall : or, Remarks on the Reports of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of Education in Wales* (Longman: 1848), p 8

<sup>224</sup> *ibid*, p 3

<sup>225</sup> Evan Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *facts, Figures and Statements*, p 16-21

<sup>226</sup> *ibid*

<sup>227</sup> J Williams, *Artegall*, p 3

absolute, and not, as they ought to be, balanced by comparison' with other countries, including England - in comparing Wales *only* with an 'ideal of perfection' they bring 'an abstract principle, a transcendental notion of what education and condition ought to be, mercilessly to bear upon the people of the Principality'.<sup>228</sup> This she describes as 'a Platonic process of world-making' in which there is a reliance on 'cursory and superficial sources' whereby 'first impressions often become permanent and indelible'.<sup>229</sup> Of course, we can go further than Jane Williams in stating that this 'ideal of perfection' is, as we have seen, the self-image of the ideal Englishman. One can, also in connection with 'useful knowledge', link this approach of transcendental ideals with Mill's statement that 'exactly in proportion as Utility is the object of every pursuit, may we regard a nation as civilised'.<sup>230</sup> In using such a method, the Commissioners have used 'isolated instances' to generalise and have thus 'judged a large and healthy family from its invalid members'.<sup>231</sup>

In this way, the respondents forensically undermine the Report's findings on the basis of the evidence supplied, as well as statistical evidence supplied by Ieuan Gwynedd. However, in doing so, the Welsh nonconformists do not really challenge the basis of the report beyond its perceived Anglican agenda. The argument is simply that they are able to provide better evidence of its prevalence by comparison to England, and also implicitly that they – like the truly competent Dissenter witnesses above - are in a better position to be 'objective'. This viewpoint does not challenge the empirical basis of the criteria of judgements, or the terms of the report. Rather, its contention is that the Commissioners have not used the evidence given them correctly, and that this may have been in error, or in a more sinister reading that they had an agenda to twist their findings. In positing themselves as simple opposite interlocutors the Welsh do not challenge the disciplinary basis of the report's discursive authority, but rather incorporate and rearticulate it into 'Welsh' terms.

As we shall see, the statistics supplied by Ieuan Gwynedd are indicative of this. Their veracity need not concern us unduly (although his sources appear to be more reliable than those of the Report). Rather, it is what they are used *for* that is important. The

---

<sup>228</sup> *ibid*

<sup>229</sup> *ibid*, p 4

<sup>230</sup> J Mill, *The History of British India* (Chicago: 1975), p 224

<sup>231</sup> J Williams, *Artegall*, p 3

attempt is to prove the report ‘wrong’ in that they have not supplied the facts necessary for its conclusions, nor have ascertained reliable facts. Therefore, the basis is a criticism of ‘the facts ascertained’ (the aim of the Report as given in Kay-Shuttleworth’s *Instructions*), but without questioning criteria of judgement in ascertaining those of the ‘facts’. They thereby perform or construct a mirror image to the findings of the Report in their construction of ‘Welshness’, in illustrating that the Welsh are ‘good’ rather than ‘bad’, using the same terms of debate without undermining the terms of debate itself. Moreover, as we shall see, at the same time as asserting this, they also provide means of making this ideal of the good (Welsh) life real through further pastoral intervention, policing and surveillance of the population under their care, and this in particular in the realm of gender, sex and sexuality.

The Welsh intelligentsia perform this supplementary identity and identification in the interlinked fields of: first, ‘useful’ and ‘religious’ knowledge and moral education (which provides a defence of Dissent and Welsh language and literature in the terms of religion *as* moral education); and second, in social morality, in particular linked to sexual deviancy (which defends and constructs the ‘Welsh nation’ in a particular gender and class relation). I will now look at these in turn.

#### **‘Useful’ and Religious Education: the Case for Moral Education and Socialisation**

Ieuan Gwynedd uses statistical evidence to illustrate that education is being ‘rapidly supplied’ in Wales. He points to the two areas where proof is needed according to the terms and presuppositions of the Report – firstly, in the deficiency in the means of education, and secondly, that that deficiency must be supplied by the state.<sup>232</sup> Gwynedd admits the first but does not see that it leads to the second as the deficiency is being ‘rapidly supplied’. As evidence he refers to Lord Brougham Committee of 1818 and the Report of the Earl of Kerry’s Committee 1808, as well as Symons’ own evidence.<sup>233</sup> He points from these figures to the progress of education in day schools has moved from a proportion of population in 1803 of 1 to 26 (21,369 scholars) to 1 to 9 (110,034 scholars) in 1846-7. Similarly for Sunday Schools, the ratio he cites as:

---

<sup>232</sup> E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *Facts, Figures and Statements*, p 16

<sup>233</sup> *ibid*, p 21

1803 – 1 to 55 (10,000 scholars) to 1 to 4 (238,740 scholars) in 1846-7.<sup>234</sup> This attests to the greater degree of intervention the Welsh pastors had achieved, and in Gwynedd's case destroyed the need for governmental intervention, and that 'Government Education has not been offered to Wales until they are in a fair way to help themselves'.<sup>235</sup>

From this idea of a continuing supply of indigenous education, Lewis Edwards makes the subsequent point that their cause therefore must be to 'harvest the peasantry's minds', and that their work was to ensure that the government has no work to be done, otherwise the governmentals are 'bound ('yn rhwym i' in the sense of feeling 'bound' to a contract, as responsibility) to intervene'.<sup>236</sup> In this way, Edwards indicates the ambivalence and ambiguity of Welsh opposition to the Report and indicates their own position of authority. To such an approach he cries 'save Wales from the folly of her partisans', before illustrating a revealing take on what constitutes patriotism, or rather against what that patriotism is constituted:

to call the report a pack of lies only, is to repeat the mistake assigned to them by the commissioners! This is not to attack patriotism – if this were the only motive driving us, it would be enough to rejoice at the report, illustrating as it does the inefficiency of the Established church in Wales: their schools worst; and that her members care little for the well-being of the people.<sup>237</sup>

True patriotism would therefore involve incorporating the Report's information as a means of bettering one's own educational practices.

Indeed, here we see that national identity is clearly linked to a particular religion, and so a particular means of education. For Edwards, the Report's view of secular knowledge as transcendental explains the antipathy toward the Welsh language, which ties with his argument for the utility of religious education.<sup>238</sup> He asserts the need for religiosity in education, rather than creating 'numbering machines' ('peiriannau rhifyddol').<sup>239</sup> Secular knowledge is placed as 'something above' in the

---

<sup>234</sup> *ibid*

<sup>235</sup> *ibid*, p 24

<sup>236</sup> L Edwards, 'Adroddiad Y Dirprwywyr' in *Detholiad o Draethodau Llenyddol Lewis Edwards* (Hughes: 1910), p 425-6

<sup>237</sup> *ibid*, p 408

<sup>238</sup> L Edwards, 'Addysg Yng Nghymru', p 403

<sup>239</sup> *ibid*, p 402

report (as we have seen in India in its displacement of religion), and cannot be enough, Edwards argues, for moral education, a view echoed by Williams and Gwynedd.<sup>240</sup>

Clearly it is moral and religious instruction that is emphasised for cultivation and socialisation. However, all these commentators emphasise the error in viewing the Welsh as ignorant in secular knowledge – of commissioner’s assistant John James’s list of books ‘of a character to be commonly read by the people’<sup>241</sup>, Williams states ‘general ignorance cannot exist where such books are commonly read and understood’.<sup>242</sup> On literature, and the accusation that the Welsh are ‘becoming more ignorant instead of more enlightened’,<sup>243</sup> Gwynedd responds to Johnson thus:

it seems, do what we will, our ignorance is taken for granted. If we say we read, one of the learned gentlemen tells us that we have no books on secular subjects. Determined to convince him of his error, we march off, and return with fifty volumes on scientific subjects, including books on history, Geography, Agriculture, Arithmetic, Music, literature, and other secular subjects. With the utmost assurance, he then informs us, that we cannot read; and when again we furnish him with proof positive that we can, not moved in the least, he tells us, “Well, it is all the same; if you can read, you cannot understand.”<sup>244</sup>

He then applies this argument to his correspondent, William Williams MP:

If you ever read Welsh books you would know that your expressed opinion in regard to Welsh literature is incorrect; but *if you do know it*, then you *cannot read the language or you cannot understand what you read*.<sup>245</sup>

He then points out that there exists a Welsh periodical literature that has a circulation of 60,000, and that the testimony of proprietors of newspapers in Wales on this matter in the Report is not by Welshmen and so is again not competent or trustworthy.<sup>246</sup>

These writers are not therefore against secular information *as such*. Their viewpoint can be characterised as the opposite position to that of propagating English literature

---

<sup>240</sup> *ibid*; J Williams, Ategall, p 20; E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales; in reply to W Wms Llandoverly* (William Rees: 1848), p 14

<sup>241</sup> Report III, 322-3

<sup>242</sup> J Williams, Artegall, p 26

<sup>243</sup> E Jones, *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales*, p 5

<sup>244</sup> *ibid*, p 6-7

<sup>245</sup> *ibid*

<sup>246</sup> *ibid*



in India (as indirect Christian knowledge) as a supposed means of encouraging natives to libraries to attain scriptural knowledge. Here, the pastoral duty is to teach Christian knowledge (itself ‘useful’ and ‘moral’) that may allow the flock to attain secular knowledge for themselves. One can see this attitude in Ieuan Gwynedd’s journal for Welsh women, *Y Gymraes* (1850).<sup>247</sup> He states here the aim as to ‘not make religion the main topic of our writings; our aim is to raise the female sex in every way – socially, morally and religious’.<sup>248</sup> Moreover in the teaching of useful knowledge ‘our aim is not to position ourselves as their teacher, but attempt to encourage them to teach each other’, indicative of the voluntarist and private aspect to this sphere.<sup>249</sup> Given that secular knowledge had already been sacralised and governmentalised in the educational apparatus in India, this was rather swimming against the tide, but was also an indication of Chatterjee’s need to defend an ‘inner’ culture as against outer materialism – the fear was that this would be lost in education if it became more statist and administered from above on the model of English Education. The response to protect this ‘inner’ culture would have effects on cultural nationalism in relation to gender and Welsh language.

### The Welsh Language and Moral Education

All writers here argue for instruction in the Welsh language. For Gwynedd it is first of all a matter of clear expediency:

*That Education, I confidently assert, must be dispensed in the language of the people, and in no other language. To suppose that the Welsh is an obstacle to the spread of knowledge is most preposterous nonsense. The Welsh is much better to convey information than the English, on account of its far greater copiousness; and supposing it only equal, an individual who can command two languages must be more intelligent than another who has only one*<sup>250</sup>

However, he then turns the conclusions of the report on the English by reversing the morality of the Welsh in relation to English, and asserting the language to be a moral instrument rather than one of immorality:

---

<sup>247</sup> ‘Y Gymraes’ means ‘The Welshwoman’

<sup>248</sup> E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *Y Gymraes* (William Owen: 1850), January 1850, p 6

<sup>249</sup> *ibid*, p 7

<sup>250</sup> E Jones, *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales*, p 14

Your views on the design of instruction are perfectly erroneous, as you seem to think that if the English Language were acquired by all the people, that all social and moral blemishes in the Principality would entirely vanish...with one or two *exceptions*, the *most Anglicised* districts in Wales have the greatest number of illegitimate children in them. As the *Welsh language and national feeling recedes, immorality encreases* [sic].<sup>251</sup>

Jane Williams sees in Lingen's celebratory prophesy that 'rail-roads and the fuller development of the great mineral beds are on the eve of multiplying the points of contact.'<sup>252</sup> In this way one can see the moral, religious and linguistic elements that were to make the Welsh language a bulwark, and 'the nation's best defence against immorality and irreligion.'<sup>253</sup> R Elwyn Hughes has illustrated how the prevailing notions of the Welsh language as pure had retarded the standardisation of scientific terms in its 'unshakeable belief in its antiquity, purity and all-encompassing nature'.<sup>254</sup>

However, this also encompassed an attitude for looking for aesthetic poetic beauty in terms that led to a free-for-all of terms that could refer to a multitude of ideas, what R Elwyn Hughes calls a sort of 'wordy nationalism'.<sup>255</sup> The idea of the Welsh language as pure meant that 'Welshifying' Greek or Latin terms was on the whole unpopular.<sup>256</sup> One finds here the linguistic equivalent of the morality of 'pure Wales, peaceful Wales' ('Cymru lan, Cymru Lonydd').<sup>257</sup> This was, in effect, a reversal of the discourse of the report's view, except that now the closed world of the Welsh language was to be conserved as a protection against the immortality and materialism of (English) modernity and development.

The assigning of the Welsh as possibly dangerous and seditious owing to the language and dissent is reversed to show that they are peaceful, loyal and orderly, and that it is

---

<sup>251</sup> *ibid*, p 13

<sup>252</sup> Report I, p 7

<sup>253</sup> S R Williams, p 73

<sup>254</sup> R Elwyn Hughes, *Nid am un Harddwch Iaith: Rhyddiaeth Gwyddoniaeth yn yn Bedwaredd Ganrif ar Bymtheg* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1990), p 13

<sup>255</sup> *ibid*

<sup>256</sup> *ibid*; interestingly, it was the proto-political-nationalist Emrys ap Iwan who was the most prominent advocate of the importation of terms, an indication of his influence on Saunders Lewis' view of Latin Welsh pan-European cultural tradition, as will be seen in chapter 3.

<sup>257</sup> On this view of Wales see in particular Hywel Teifi Edwards, *Codi'r Hen Wlad yn ei Hol* (Gomer: 1989)

in fact the English – or ‘Anglicised’ - lower classes that are disorderly. As Ieuan Gwynedd writes in response to William Williams MP:

But has it never struck you, that Chartism was imported from England, that it spread chiefly among Anglicised Welshmen as far as Wales was concerned, and that *two* out of every *three* leaders in the attack on Westgate Hotel at Newport were Englishmen?...the Welshman who quotes the Chartist insurrection and the misdeeds of Rebecca as a proof of welsh ignorance, ought either to cross and never recross the Severn, or betake himself to – a Lunatic Asylum.<sup>258</sup>

The morality of the Welsh is thus constructed in opposition to the unruly English working class. The point of blame for Rebecca ‘originated on account of the illegal conduct of Aristocracy, Magistrates and English toll collectors’. While maintaining the complicity of the upper Anglican and *anglicised* gentry to disorder, this response also creates an idea of the classless, pure Welshman, who is certainly not an ‘English’ or ‘Anglicised’ Chartist by nature. Here we see a convergence with the Report, which sees the innocent Welsh imagination as in danger of coming under the influence of malevolent forces. Similarly when Jane Williams points out the discrepancy between Johnson’s description of Merthyr Tydfil as ‘the most depraved and uncivilised locality in Wales’ and Lingen’s description in seeing no ‘public brawling or disturbances’ and his statistic that there are only 12 policemen for 40,000 inhabitants, with no indication of a need for more, she is indicating the civilised, peaceful nature of the Welsh, and that this has been achieved by Welsh Dissent.<sup>259</sup>

However, there is no argument about the terms of deviancy or morality by which the Report operates, only a disavowal of Welsh involvement in sedition or at least responsibility for that involvement, as ‘duped’ by the cunning English working-class leaders. The assignation and categorisation of deviancy is simply placed elsewhere. This links very easily with the Report’s own Celticist view of the Welsh as imaginative, and requiring leadership from ‘outside’. Indeed, this construction of Welsh nationality depends upon these terms, in its contrast to the English of both classes. Here also, Chartism has been expunged of any political content by its assignation as immoral, evil, or as the fruits of ignorance. But the solution to this perceived evil and disorder lies in ‘Welsh civility’ and nonconformist education, not

---

<sup>258</sup> E Jones, *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales*, p 6

<sup>259</sup> J Williams, *Artegall*, p 8-9

in the English 'useful' knowledge. That the Welsh are in need of moral teaching and leadership is not disputed. Rather, it is who is best placed to lead.

Indeed, Dissent was seen to have achieved the civilising mission already in Wales:

it is natural, it is necessary, that a new and might impulse arising in the great deep of the civilised world's opinion, should be communicated to the open seas, and to the channels and bays of English society, before it can be felt in the creeks and inlets, crevices and recesses, which lie hid among the Cambrian mountains. But the active Genius of Wales has not waited for the coming in of the tidal wave; a touch of her wand has poured fourth [sic] streams of improvement from the native spring.<sup>260</sup>

It is clear, therefore, that this construction of the Welsh 'gwerin' accepts the terms of debate, and simply asserts a mirror image of Welsh exceptionality. This exceptionality is here linked, rather ambiguously, to Empire, but point made is that Wales is already receiving a civilising education through Dissent and pastoral power.

#### **The Welsh Moral Subject in Education**

In outlining this basis of moral religious and Welsh language education, the respondents also refute the portrayal of Welsh morality in the report, and in doing so construct their image of the Welsh nation on a moral basis, which is in fact again a mirroring of the Report's viewpoint. Again the evidence is that of statistics and a more 'objective' viewpoint than that found in the report, with the statistics emanating mostly from the work of Ieuan Gwynedd, and reproduced by the other writers. The objections are to the picture of Welsh morality as incorrect, or partial, and an opposed construction of the Welsh woman as pure (or at least to be made pure, as there is disciplinary work that arises from that formulation), certainly in relation to English women of the lower classes.

In his usual method, Ieuan Gwynedd supplies empirical evidence on chastity and sexual morals, which are again utilised by the other commentators to disprove the report's findings. Gwynedd supplies statistics on illegitimacy as supplied by the Registrar-General, and illustrates that the rate of illegitimacy in Wales stands at 6.8% to England's 6.7%, a statistical difference that he does not believe justifies such a

---

<sup>260</sup> *ibid*, p 22

gloomy picture of Welsh morals.<sup>261</sup> Moreover, to every 100,000 women, Wales's mean figure of illegitimacy is 19 lower than that of England (403 to 422).<sup>262</sup>

His message is that Welsh women are more moral than in England. It is also alleged by Gwynedd that unlike in England illegitimacy in Wales arises from a breach of promise; quoting the Commissioners into the Rebecca Riots, he states that 'the women are never in the family-way unless deceived by a promise of marriage'.<sup>263</sup> As such sin arises from a far more innocent source than in England. Consequently he states with confidence:

I trust that it is evident that the state of Wales in a social, educational, and moral point of view, must be superior to the descriptions given by the Commissioners – that the labouring population of Wales are much more intelligent and moral than the same class in England – and that the daughters of Cambria need not blush, when their reputation is compared with that of their Anglo-Saxon sisters.<sup>264</sup>

As these exacting statistics illustrate this is again a reversal of the dominant discourse, which retains within its field of the Commissioners assumptions. Welsh nonconformity retains the idea of utilising their pastoral power to discipline sexual morality, and the Report encourages them to redouble their efforts in this field. This can be seen in Ieuan Gwynedd's main literary response to the report – in January 1850 he published the first women's magazine in Welsh, *Y Gymraes*. Despite its short run of eighteen months, this retained its influence beyond its publication run. Another important journal for women begun in 1879, *Y Frythones*, referred to him as the 'immortal' Ieuan Gwynedd, and republished many of *Y Gymraes*'s articles.<sup>265</sup> The famed early twentieth century Welsh educationist O M Edwards would state of him:

As a writer he served Wales best...particularly with *Y Gymraes*. He saw how important Welsh women were; he knew they could change the fashion of scorning the language of their country.

Fel ysgrifennydd y gwasanaethodd Gymru orau...chyda'r *Gymraes* yn enwedig. Gwelodd mor bwysig oedd merched Cymru; gwyddai y medrent hwy newid y ffasiwn o ddirmygu iaith eu gwlad.<sup>266</sup>

---

<sup>261</sup> E Jones, *Facts, Figures and Statements*, p 35

<sup>262</sup> *ibid*, p 36

<sup>263</sup> *ibid*, p 38

<sup>264</sup> *ibid*

<sup>265</sup> S R Williams, 'Brad y Tir Du', p 81

<sup>266</sup> O M Edwards, *I Godi'r Hen Wlad yn ei Hol*, p 59

He also advocated that they be educated. But this was done on the basis of sexual difference and separation of spheres. This can be seen in the myriad articles on cooking and housework that appeared. Women were also agents of social morality, a typical story involving subject matter such as how a wife stopped nagging and ran her household properly suddenly found her wayward husband a model of temperance and civility, rather than escaping to the public house.<sup>267</sup> Moreover it was also a place where discipline, with the bulwark of the Welsh language, could be transmitted and instrumentalised with its moral cultural value – women were encouraged to speak Welsh with their families. This educational and didactic journal for women could be summed up in Gwynedd’s own phrase – ‘we would like to see Wales PURE’ (‘hoffwn weld Cymru’n BUR’).<sup>268</sup> Again, we see the response to the report as an attempt to make Wales respectable, civil and so, modern, and the construction of women as pure moral guardians, defenders of culture, language and morality was a vital part of this modernisation, and the construction of a different moral and high culture.

#### **Constructing Welsh womanhood and cultivating a civilised nation**

The ambivalences, spaces and translation of the discourses of education into Wales that have been outlined in this chapter are illustrated in the construction of Welsh womanhood. The 1847 Report was notorious for its description of immoral Welsh femininity, and the response was to prove that this was not so. The authority of speaking for women, and the need to construct such a figure, indicate a similar ambivalent position of the need for the supplement of culture to natural femininity, in order to create naturalised women, and this through female education. But this is also an assertion and construction of cultural purity.

Writing under the nom de plume ‘Gwenllian Gwent’ in *Y Gymraes*, but widely accepted to be Lady Llanover, the creator of such national ‘traditions’ as the Welsh dress, wrote an appeal to Welshwomen to ‘APPEAR AS SHE IS’ (‘YMDDANGOS FEL YR YDYW’).<sup>269</sup> As Jane Aaron notes:

---

<sup>267</sup> E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *Y Gymraes* – one could choose from any issue here, such is this trope’s prevalence

<sup>268</sup> *ibid*, January 1850, p 3

<sup>269</sup> G Gwent, ‘Anerchiad i Gymruesau Gymru’ in *Y Gymraes*, Jan 1850, 8-11 - capitalised in original

This is not a liberal appeal to self-expression; on the contrary, Gwennllian Gwent has very definite, indeed dogmatic, views as to how Welsh woman should by rights appear.<sup>270</sup>

This exhortation for the Welsh woman to be ‘as she is’ thus denotes the central problematic of what a discourse of female education sets out to do – it constructs its object, and as with the other discourses of education here, it must construct ‘Welsh woman’ as split as ‘there’, but to be uncovered for the future from within the subject herself. Again, nature requires culture in order to become itself – this is necessary discursive condition for an ‘educable’ subject.

Nevertheless, as we have seen the tenor of this cultural education is constructed as different from English education, as a moral, religious and Welsh language education. In this one can clearly see the linking of discourses of female education and nationalism. Frantz Fanon noted, ‘there are close connections between the structure of the family and the structure of the nation.’<sup>271</sup> As Yuval-Davis and Anthias have noted, the nation is linked symbolically to the figure of woman and gender in that they are ‘participating centrally in the ideological reproduction of the collectivity and as transmitters of its culture’ and as ‘signifiers of ethnic/national differences – as a focus and symbol in ideological discourses used in the construction, reproduction and transformation of national categories’.<sup>272</sup> Under these terms, women also take an active part in national struggles.<sup>273</sup> Jayawardena argues that women’s movement were integral to national resistance movements which were ‘acted out against a backdrop of nationalist struggles aiming at achieving political independence, asserting a national identity, and modernising society’.<sup>274</sup>

If the role of gender was to assert difference, how was this achieved and what effect did it have in Wales? Jane Aaron, in her excellent books *Pur Fel y Dur* [*Pure as Iron*] and *Nineteenth Century Women’s Writing in Wales*, has indicated how the Welsh woman was constructed in similar terms but as different from discourses of ideal English womanhood. This was done in contrast to Coventry Patmore’s paean to ideal

---

<sup>270</sup> J Aaron, *Nineteenth Century Women’s Writing in Wales: Nation, Gender and Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2007), p 80

<sup>271</sup> F Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (Pluto Press: 1986), p 141

<sup>272</sup> N Yuval-Davis & F Anthias, *Woman-Nation-State* (St Martin’s Press: 1989), p 7

<sup>273</sup> *ibid*

<sup>274</sup> K Jayawardeni, *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* (Zed Books: 1986), p 3

womanhood as the 'Angel in the House', which describes her as pure, innocent, child-like.<sup>275</sup> As Aaron puts it of different responses in Wales, this ideal is one of undisciplined sexuality:

The ethos of the 'Angel' does not sit well with the orthodoxies of Calvinism, as it was practised by...female members of the Welsh nonconformist sects. Female Calvinists, like male ones, could be pure only by virtue of God's grace, not by virtue of their gender; the notion that through her sex woman was 'marr'd less than man by mortal fall' must have seemed particularly nonsensical to devout Bible readers familiar with the book of Genesis. Such qualities as dependency, childlikeness and amiability were part and parcel of 'feminine perfection' according to Patmore...innocent indulgence would have been part of the childlike charm of Patmore's Angel, but for the ideal Welsh women it was a sin.<sup>276</sup>

In contrast, the ideal of Welsh womanhood, as Aaron quotes from a series of stories in 1886, was to be 'pure like iron'.<sup>277</sup> The ideal was one of stern self-discipline, and to contrast 'iron-ness' with the 'velvet-ness', the complacent child-like femininity of the English Angel at home, which was linked with idleness and immorality.<sup>278</sup> As Aaron notes, this led to a view of the Welsh woman with a 'militaristic morality', as a 'Mother in Israel'.<sup>279</sup> This construction of stern and strong women in opposition to a master culture is seen elsewhere. bell hooks has analysed the historical stereotype of the strong hard-working black mother contrasted to that of weak white women in the USA.<sup>280</sup> Partha Chatterjee has indicated the similar construction of the Hindu woman as pure and moral in opposition to the velvet-like English woman – 'an inner domain of sovereignty far removed from the arena of political contest'.<sup>281</sup>

While this morality, as seen in Ieuan Gwynedd, is to be used in the home, and the aim of a female's role as a moral agent in society was as reproducing morality and culture in the home of sons and husbands, the boundaries between home and the outside world could not be sustained completely. As Russell Davies notes, 'The family was

---

<sup>275</sup> J Aaron, *Nineteenth Century Women's Writing in Wales*, p 89-90

<sup>276</sup> *ibid*

<sup>277</sup> J Aaron, *Pur fel y Dur* (University of Wales Press: 1998), p 8-9

<sup>278</sup> *ibid*

<sup>279</sup> J Aaron, *Nineteenth Century Women's Writing in Wales*, p 94-5

<sup>280</sup> bell hooks, *Ain't I a Woman: black women and feminism* (Pluto: 1982)

<sup>281</sup> P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World* (Zed Books: 1993), p 120-1



central to the Christian cause and the religious household was the base from which to counter the evils of the world outside.’<sup>282</sup>

However, the home was also a target for intervention and discipline in order to achieve this ideal, a means of policing morality. As such, the role of women was also to spread this militaristic morality in society, and spaces for women in Welsh society for such interventions arose in the Temperance societies. As the prominent Welsh Liberal, D Lleufer Thomas, said in 1900:

As educated women, you can do much for the welfare and happiness of your own sex - and indirectly of mine – by quiet unobtrusive talk with mothers and housewives as to the laws of health, the elements of sanitary science...how to make the home sweet and cheerful for the husbands and sons on returning from work.<sup>283</sup>

While this was clearly a conservative agenda of morality, it was not only with conservative effects. As Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan notes:

Although the temperance movement was basically conservative in its emphasis on morality, there can be no doubt of its importance in broadening the horizons of Welsh women and in helping them move into new spheres of activity, outside the home.<sup>284</sup>

It was from this position of authority of speaking for idealised, natural Welsh womanhood that middle-class women were given a cultural and political voice: as W Gareth Evans notes, ‘the Temperance movement recognised the importance of the educated woman as a reformist agent in society.’<sup>285</sup>

However, on entering the public sphere, discussion in Women’s journals such as *Y Frythones* and the re-established *Y Gymraes* in the last decades of the nineteenth century were not limited to temperance, but also to nationalism, suffrage and Empire. The equal rights of women were enshrined in the manifesto of the short-lived Home

---

<sup>282</sup> R Davies, *Secret Sins: Sex, Violence and Society in Carmarthenshire 1870-1920* (University of Wales Press: 2004), p 154

<sup>283</sup> cited in W Gareth Evans, *Female Education and Emancipation: The Welsh Experience* (University of Wales Press: 1990), p 16

<sup>284</sup> C Lloyd-Morgan, ‘From Temperance to Suffrage’ in Angela V John *Our Mothers’ Land: chapters in Welsh women’s history 1830-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1991)

<sup>285</sup> W Gareth Evans, *Education and Female Emancipation*, p 16

Rule movement *Cymru Fydd* (*Young Wales*).<sup>286</sup> W Llywelyn Williams MP placed women's suffrage at the top of his list, indicating that 'the growing power and influence of women in our public life' testified to Wales's readiness for Home Rule.<sup>287</sup>

The symbolic position of women thus linked 'temperance, womanhood, the Welsh language and the sense of belonging to a Welsh nation.'<sup>288</sup> The ideal could be a self-fulfilling prophecy, in that many Welsh women lived their lives to that ideal of self-discipline.<sup>289</sup> However, as Sian Rhiannon Williams notes, those who did not conform to this ideal were not considered real 'Cymruesau'.<sup>290</sup> The position of authority had a clear basis in middle-class Victorian morality. Nevertheless, as Bohata has noted, such views of cultural transmission had their subversive effects, such as in regard to the importance of the transmission of the Welsh language:

The idea that the domestic, as opposed to the public, sphere may constitute an important site of resistance is also recognised in studies of diasporic peoples or of those who have experienced cultural dislocation through colonisation. In such cases, the home may become the only place where a subaltern culture may be transmitted. Passing on an unofficial, 'native' language such as Welsh, at a time when parents were actively *not* to pass on the language to their children, can be viewed as an explicit act of resistance to cultural imperialism. This complicates a straightforwardly conservative understanding<sup>291</sup>

As we have seen, the 'home' could not be wholly separated from society – indeed, we have noted that it can become the target of policing of morals. The private and public are not split by a clear-cut border but in shifting and always contested positions, as we have seen in the need for 'unobtrusive talk' by educated women and what may be termed the moral harnessing of the busybody. Similarly the Welsh national movement of the late nineteenth century also saw itself as seeking Home Rule within the Imperial mission, and this without any contradiction – borders were not hard and fast between relation of empire, nation and gender, but were inextricably linked. Bohata views this in gendered terms as:

---

<sup>286</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited*, p 60

<sup>287</sup> J Aaron, *Nineteenth Century Welsh Women's Writing*, p 163

<sup>288</sup> Sian Rhiannon Williams, 'The True "Cymraes": Images of Women in Women's Nineteenth Century Welsh Periodicals' in A V John (ed) *Our Mothers' Land: Chapters in Welsh Women's History 1830-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1991), p 87-8

<sup>289</sup> *ibid*

<sup>290</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited*, p 71-2

<sup>291</sup> *ibid*, p 76

The nation was concerned more with proving itself a worthy partner (a wife to England's royal consort perhaps) in the British imperial enterprise than with attempting to extricate itself from any perceived status as a colonised nation within Britain.

Such images of 'Imperial Wales' will be further explored in the next chapter, and it only serves here to indicate the complications of gender, nation and empire. This can be seen further with the role of the Welsh language – in the ideal figure of Welsh womanhood, the defence and transmission of the Welsh language were of vital importance. One can certainly view this as resulting from the loss of education to the governmentalised, anglicised sphere, and as retreating to the 'private', however it is also true that this movement allows for the sustaining of an 'inner' culture as analysed by Chatterjee in India, as a sphere to be intervened into as cultural nationalism. The ideological battle over state education can be seen in Wales, in particular, as exemplifying the wish to keep the sphere of education, kept as it had been under the chapels and Churches, from passing from the 'spiritual' to the 'material'.

The Welsh therefore maintained a split between the 'spiritual' or 'cultural' and the 'material', with the latter being linked to Britishness and Empire. That these two elements overlap is clear, of course, and Wales is not innocent in benefiting materially from imperialism. However, in the assertion of difference and in constructing identity, this separation is vital. It is noticeable that the first act for Wales is that of the Temperance Act of 1881, with its clear echo of nonconformist discipline.

In this way, the Welsh language and religion was retained in the receding pastoral power of the pulpit, Sunday Schools and the home, but education was governmentalised, and so, based on the institutional practices in India that had calcified into moral identity of English civility which would work to the interest of individuals, Anglicised. The retaining of English literature and language as privileged subjects in this educational apparatus would also in practice supplant technical education (agriculture, geology, engineering, mechanical), illustrating the continuing discursive power of the field of 'moral education' as English, as constructed in India from discrete elements and re-imported to Britain. Nonetheless, one continues to see the cultural elements of Welsh nonconformism in operation and intervening into the lives of subjects, and the symbolism of idealised welsh women is vitally important in

this sphere, and in the construction of a separate – at least culturally - nation. Despite this assertion of difference, it is clear that in being discursively linked to the universalised view of (English) civilisation, even when set in opposition to it, the bases of its identification mark it out – like English civility itself - as necessarily hybrid.

This Welsh identification emerges from within, and finds spaces for subversion in, the discourse of education, and this translation and rearticulation of the discourse had material political effects on the role of women, the space of the Welsh language in protecting ‘inner’ culture. In accepting the terms and assumptions of that discourse it did however construct a moral ideal of womanhood that marked out most real women as failed; and this was a necessary gap to the work of discipline. The process of governmentality as linked to the English language led to the feminisation of the Welsh language into the private sphere, from which the pure Welsh woman was to have an important – if conservative role – in defending it. However, this position also allowed for the increased political role for Welsh women as carriers of Welsh moral value which had been displaced from the institutions of education.

## Conclusion

The differences that the writers here construct for Welsh civility are in fact a mirror image to the report itself, and so fall within the same framework. The Report asserts that Welsh language and dissent posits a danger, increases immorality and is a barrier to progress; the response asserts it is moral, orderly and progressive. The report asserts the need for secular English knowledge as a panacea to all the ills it describes; the response asserts the superiority of religion, the Welsh language and culture as the basis for moral education, which the Dissenters have already proved. As can be seen in *Y Gymraes* and its effects, the Welsh nonconformists here clearly defend their interests as disciplinary pastors to the poor in constructing moral and civil peoples – it simply asserts that this is better done by voluntarists, and in Welsh. It is on this basis that Ieuan Gwynedd invokes liberty - ‘*We are determined to be free*, and that you will

find if you attempt to coerce us'<sup>292</sup>, and also how Jane Williams invokes – in capitals – 'BRITISH LIBERTY'.<sup>293</sup>

*Such a call to liberty is on the basis of the autonomy of Welsh 'pastors' to civilise their own flock can be identified as British liberty because it is a repetition and rearticulation of the discourse of liberation, education and civilisation of English Education constructed in India and imported into Britain, and the Welsh context. The construction of Welsh civility, and the concomitant need for surveillance and policing of the tenor of that civility was a development of its encounter with modern educational and governmental discourses. As Partha Chatterjee notes, 'Nationalism denies the alleged inferiority of the colonised people,' but does so on the grounds 'on which colonial domination was based'.<sup>294</sup>*

While it is clear that the emergence of such Welsh identification with morality, religion and language is set up in opposition to the 1847 report it is also complicit with the terms on which those reports are based, retaining its linking of education with security and to the fears of - and need to intervene in – the population at large. In this sense, it follows the civilising ideal indicated in Macaulay's minutes, and is linked to the ideas of the subject to be educated, developed and naturalised of discourses of education generally. This is the discourse, as Gwyn Alf Williams put it in different terms 'translated and transmuted' to the Welsh context; however the differences of that translation are vital to understanding the developments which followed, and the protection of the inner 'spiritual' and cultural sphere, and the relations of power and the positions of authority on which they were based. While the governmentalisation of education certainly involved an Anglicisation of what had previously been in the pastoral power of (some of) the Welsh, there remained other sites which could be worked on, and it is in the feminised positions of the home and the signifier of Welsh woman, constructed in opposition to, but on similar terms to

---

<sup>292</sup> E Jones (Ieuan Gwynedd), *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales*, p 15

<sup>293</sup> J Williams, *Artegall*, p 29; it is to be remembered that the traces of Welsh as the 'British tongue' remained at this point; that is, of the Welsh as the original Britons. See J Hunter on the historical debates in the sixteenth century around this history [*Sofffestri'r Saeson: Hanesyddiaeth a Hunaniaeth yn Oes y Tuduriaid* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000), p 28-50]

<sup>294</sup> P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*, p 30

English womanhood, that ideals of cultural difference and exceptionality and the 'inner life' of the nation could be 'preserved', or more accurately, created.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Repeat Performances: The Princes of Wales' Investiture Rituals 1911 and 1969**

On Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> July 1911, on a scorching hot sunny day, a great hullabaloo arrived at the historical town of Caernarfon in North West Wales. Having spent the night in the Royal Yacht at Holyhead, the Royal Family took a special Royal Saloon train to Griffith's Crossing just outside Caernarfon, where the young Prince Edward (later to be Edward VIII) was to be invested with the title and negligible powers of Prince of Wales.<sup>295</sup> From Griffith's Crossing, the royal train would drive into Caernarfon, escorted by the Welsh lifeguards, via the North Road route, a two and a half mile road which was to be manned by the Welsh Territorials, of whom there numbered over 12,000. This was the largest military spectacle ever seen in Wales, as behoves a royal pageant.

At Caernarfon their majesties would be presented with a loyal address of welcome in both English and Welsh, upon a specially constructed platform on Castle Square. From this point two processions would be formed – that of the King and Queen and that of the Prince – before entering to a fanfare of twenty one guns the Castle by the Water Gate. Here they would be welcomed by the Constable of the Castle, who had been since 1908 David Lloyd George, the famous Welsh Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had had to rush from busy proceedings on his controversial national insurance bill in the House of Commons for the investiture of 'my prince'.<sup>296</sup> The Prince's procession would be first to enter the Castle, marked by the hoisting of the Prince's flag, followed five minutes later by the King, marked by the lowering of said flag.

---

<sup>295</sup> Unless otherwise stated, the account of the 1911 ceremonial is taken from *The Book of the Investiture* (The Educational Publishing Co: 1911); *Wales and her Prince: The Investiture and all About it* (Daily News: 1911) *Cymru am Byth: Programme of the Investiture of the Prince of Wales* (Arvon Printing & Stationery: 1911); *The Investiture of HRH the Prince of Wales: Handbook and Official Programme of Festivities* (Liverpool Courter: 1911);

<sup>296</sup> *Baner ac Amserau Cymru, 15/7/1911*, his words are quoted in Welsh as 'rhaid i mi adael yn gynnar, er cymmeryd rhan yn Urddiad fy Nhywysog' (i must leave early, to take part in my prince's Investiture')

Their majesties and the prince would then assume the robes of state. Following this the two processions would proceed to the site of the Investiture Ceremony – the raised platform in the great inner courtyard. Stands would seat between 12-15,000 invited guests, including the mayors of all the Welsh boroughs and a 400-strong national choir.

The Investiture would then take place at 2.30 p.m. Trumpeters would announce the beginning and ending of the Investiture with fanfares. To mark the investiture, the Prince would be presented with the traditional royal insignia of the Prince of Wales, a Sword, Chaplet, Ring and Rod, each carried to him by eminent Welsh nobles. The two standards of the Welsh Dragon and the White Wolfhound would be carried by eminent figures. On arrival before their majesties the Prince would bow down three times before the king, whereupon the Home Secretary, Winston Churchill, would read the Letters Patent, and at appropriate moments the King would invest his son with the insignia. As Edward put it in his memoirs: ‘Upon my head he put the coronet cap as a token of principality, and into my hand the gold verge of government, and on my middle finger the gold ring of responsibility.’<sup>297</sup>

The Prince would then pay homage to Wales with the words: ‘I, Edward, Prince of Wales, do become your liege man of life and limb and of earthly worship and faith and truth. I will bear you to live and die against all manner of folks.’ Following this the letters patent would be handed to the Prince who would take a seat to the right of the throne. Proceedings would then turn to a short religious service, conducted by the Bishops of Bangor and St Asaph and the Rev Evan Jones (Caernarfon) and Rev D Griffith (Troedriwdalar). A selection of Welsh airs would be sang by the choir, concluding with the National Anthem. Finally, the Prince would be presented with a bilingual address on behalf of the Welsh people.

After the ceremony the Prince would move to Queen Eleanor’s Gateway, overlooking the Castle Square, holding some 70,000 people. It is here where, as legend would have it, Edward I (or Edward the Conqueror, or ‘Longshanks’) presented his own newborn son to the Welsh people stating that he was presenting to them the Prince of

---

<sup>297</sup> Edward Windsor, *A King’s Story: the Memoirs of HRH the Duke of Windsor* (G P Putnam: 1951), p 222



Wales who, as he had promised, spoke no English. From here the Prince would address the people, which, ably coached by Lloyd George in a smattering of Welsh, included Welsh phrases such ‘môr o ganu yw Gymru i gyd’ (‘All of Wales is a sea of song’). The procession would then leave the Castle by the King’s Gate, and make a circuit of the Castle, to allow as many members of the public to see the pageant.

At the conclusion of the ceremonial the family would return to their Royal Yacht in Holyhead, before preparing themselves for a busy weekend of ceremonies celebrating the great achievements of Welsh liberalism and culture, the Bangor University College, and the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth. The whole fanfare was celebrated in Caernarfon throughout the week, including repeated showing of *Glyndwr Tywysog Cymru – the Investiture Play*, and several concerts, particularly of Celtic airs.

The 1969 Investiture, in all important respects the same scripted ritual, took place under the threat of violence. Widespread protests occurred, and bombs were exploded in opposition to the Investiture. A small bomb was mistaken by the crowds for the beginning of the twenty one gun salute.<sup>298</sup> Prince Charles spoke of hoping to avoid being covered in too much ‘egg and tomato’, and there were bitter disputes within Wales between loyalists and protesters, which came to a head with protests in the Urdd Eisteddfod, when Charles was invited to give a patriotic speech.<sup>299</sup> In preparation for the Investiture, Charles had spent a term at Aberystwyth University where he was taught Welsh by E G Millward, Welsh lecturer and vice president of the Welsh national party, Plaid Cymru.<sup>300</sup> At the same time hunger-strikes were performed by Welsh students who were prominent members of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg* (Welsh Language Society).<sup>301</sup>

This chapter focuses on the way in which around these two rituals (or, this ritual repeated) different meanings and national myths were constructed, drawing upon different discourses of Welsh identity. These events allow us to see how the event is read and written by allowing us to view hegemony and power in meaning

---

<sup>298</sup> G Thomas (Viscount Tonypandy), *I Serve* (Atalink Ltd: 1994), p 24

<sup>299</sup> D Gwynn, ‘Arwisgiad 1969: Yr Ymateb Gwleidyddol’ in *Cof Cenedl XX (Gomer: 2000)*, p 176

<sup>300</sup> *ibid*, p 170-1

<sup>301</sup> *ibid*

construction, by bringing out which particular readings have acquired salience at particular times, and for which particular reason. It is this narration that tells us of the politicisation of memory, and the construction of national myths, and their significance.

Two rituals almost sixty years apart indicate two distinct societies, as illustrated by the different meanings articulated around the ritual in the same specific site of Caernarfon Castle. To coin a cliché, the past is a foreign country, and these two pasts are indicative of a multitude of foreign countries – or different narratives of Welshness - within Wales historically. The comparison of two performances of the same ritual allows a view of ‘repetition’ here that can indicate how different viewpoints and articulations of identity can be constructed around the same ritual in different context. In attempting to formulate this link of performance, text and history I hope to get away from the rather formulaic (and simplistic) separation of text and history, materialism and textuality, by illustrating how this ritual event creates space(s) for *writing the event*, and also how in this way the event is reinscribed in different contexts.

The event was not universally reflected upon but was done so by particular sections of the society and the media. It is often assumed in analysis of ritual that there is a transparent link between the masses at large and the crowds at the ceremonial itself, a projection onto the crowds as representing the masses which is often that of the analyst herself. This is a mistake that will not be repeated here, and the theoretical reasons for this as will be outlined in the first part of this chapter.

Finding the voices of those silent masses (or the ‘subaltern’ in Gramscian or postcolonial terms) is beyond the scope of this chapter. Rather, the aim is to analyse how the Investiture was narrativised as an event by those who were allowed to speak, or perhaps were interested (with all that word’s connotations) in writing about, and placing particular meanings upon, this ritual. That is, the chapter explores how the ritual allowed space for commentary upon ideas of Welshness, Britishness, Empire and so on, and how the national discourse and codes these commentaries draw upon allowed for what could and could not be said. This approach illustrates how an event is narrativised, and how commentary gives meaning to the event akin to the way

liturgy imbues the religious ritual with meaning. I will argue that this event in fact allowed space for retroactive subversion and counter-narrations, and the politicisation of memory (and forgetting) that would not have been available had the event not been reinvented in 1911 in order to bring Wales and ‘their prince’ together. Symbolically, historically, socially and politically, spaces had been opened by shifts in the discourses in these fields. The 1969 investiture is a useful point of comparison in order to understand the limitations of what could be said in discourses of national identity in 1911.

The first section analyses some of the main theories of ritual. Here I attempt to illustrate how I will view royal ritual as opening space for a commentary on, rather than simply a reflection of society, and this has particular significance for power relations and subjectivity. In this reading, commentary on the royal ritual temporally ‘doubles’ the national subject – in always ‘having been’, but also needing ‘to-become’. The role of ritual is often theorised as achieving both, as both a reflection of, and creation of, the national subject. It does this because it has no intrinsic or essential meaning in itself, which is a prerequisite to analysing power relations and contestation and cultural hegemony in the assigning of meanings to the rituals. Laclau has analysed how such empty signifiers may lead to political contestation.<sup>302</sup>

The second section analyses the 1911 investiture, which also indicates a construction of difference for the Welsh context, but also as reinforcing its role within the British Empire. Ritual is assumed by contemporaries too as representing (or a representation of) something called ‘society’, although what that society ‘is’ may be more ambiguous than this representation assumes. Oppositional discourse, as analysed in the third section also depends on such a view of representation, but by viewing British ideology as masking and distorting the reality of proper Welsh nationhood beneath. This counter-discourse also depends upon tropes of sentimental and immemorial symbols of Welsh royalty as a real symbol in opposition to the falsehood of the Investiture. This section ends by analysing which myths linked to the investiture have attained cultural hegemony in Wales today, and how this may be seen as a repetition

---

<sup>302</sup> E Laclau, *Emancipation(s)* (Verso: 1996), p 36-46

of the performative power in its own self-identification, with its own exclusions in the name of *its* particular articulation of the nation.

### **Part 1: Ritual, Representation and Society**

The problems of utilising the term ‘ritual’ are vast. Firstly, the array of events in a multitude of places that can be described as ‘rituals’ are virtually endless. This is not only to be seen in the anthropological literature itself, which can move from rituals of circumcision to Ndembu religious rituals to Christian rituals spanning two millennia, but that the term ritual can theoretically be used for virtually any social act. Catherine Bell warns that ‘the theoretical construction of ritual becomes a reflection of the theorist’s method and the motor of a discourse in which the concerns of the theorist take center stage’.<sup>303</sup> It is therefore important to note how ritual will be used in this context. Much of ritual studies can be seen as moving from the particular situation to the universal via the term ritual, which becomes a catch all term for human activity and human thought in general. It is in this sense that one can see that ritual can be utilised universally and uniformly – and so reductively - if used as an unproblematic concept.

The concept of ritual must be articulated in relation to other concepts. Firstly I analyse viewpoints in which ritual is seen to represent something holistic taken as ‘a society’, in both Durkheimian and Marxist views. In doing so I also problematise power as it can be seen in viewing the ritual as referential to something, as this also depends on authorship and a view of top-down imposition. This ‘representation’ of society is problematised, and so the argument moves to an alternative view of ritual as essentially meaningless. This is then linked to writing its meaning, which can also be read as ‘liturgy’ or ‘commentary on’ the ritual and is itself a process of meaning-making of that event, which is necessarily linked to hegemonic power. Decentring of the event is required in order to understand the writing of the event’s intertextuality, and also of a view of meaning (or its lack) linked to hegemony. This indicates how meaning of the ritual is discursively constructed, and in our case, what can be said in one performance could not be said in another.

---

<sup>303</sup> C Bell, *Ritual :Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford University Press: 1997), p 81

The classic analysis reflecting the strongly Durkheimian trend in British social anthropology is the work of Shils and Young of royal ritual as a mirror to 'society', which is seen as reflecting a deep consensus of the moral values of Britain. The reception of this 'performance' is passive, an easy transmission of 'value consensus'. This essentially apolitical religious analogy is seen in Shils and Young's analysis of the coronation of Elisabeth II in 1953:

Intermittent rituals bring the society or varying sectors of it repeatedly into contact with this vessel of the sacred values. The Coronation provided at one time and for practically the entire society such an intensive contact with the sacred that we are justified in interpreting it...as a great act of national communion.<sup>304</sup>

This holism in anthropological convergence with sociology undermines the differentiation between royal rituals and divergences of meaning that can be read from them. In other words, they tend to follow a circular pattern of ritual and reception whereby meaning and society can be read from ritual, which is itself constituted from the society it reflects. Whom and what this society itself *is* is taken as self-explanatory. Moreover, ritual is seen as uniting disparate sections of that society in and by itself.

Lukes has pointed out the problems of the 'neo-Durkheimians' view of ritual. He states on such views of ritual that:

They turn out on inspection to make a number of distinct claims: (1) political ritual is an *index* or *evidence* of (pre-existing) value integration...(2) it is an *expression* of such integration ('society reaffirms the moral values which constitute it as a society'); (3) it is a *mechanism* for bringing about such integration...; and (4) it itself *constitutes* such integration.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> E Shils and M Young, 'The Meaning of the Coronation' in *The Sociological Review I* (1953), p 80

<sup>305</sup> S Lukes, *Essays in Social Theory* (Macmillan : 1977), p 62

As he notes, this is too simplistic a view of integration. He says of Shils and Young in particular, ‘they never even consider the possibility that there may be divergences in the interpretation of such values within a society’.<sup>306</sup> The following passage on the 1969 Prince’s investiture is indicative of a use of the Shils and Young method to view the Investiture as a national communion:

It is as if the Investiture brought to the fore a profound emotional commitment to the Monarchy...Most ordinary *Englishmen* were caught up in the spirit of the event to an extraordinary degree and communicated their enthusiasm to each other. The feelings about the Queen and Prince Charles which the Investiture evoked, managed to fuse personal and public concerns in a symbolic fashion that Durkheim would have understood.<sup>307</sup> [my emphasis]

This, of course, for a ceremony that took place in Wales to purportedly invest ‘their’ Prince! The reflection of society assumes that ‘society’ to be a particular anglocentric one, which frames the national subject within the nation-state as ‘English’. It is also notable that the citizens caught up in this event are automatically male. This viewpoint indicates a problem in readings of the monarchy, that it is a ‘part’ that represents the whole (e.g. ‘society’ or ‘nation’). The unity of this ‘wholeness’ (even with its conflictual elements) is unquestioned.

What we see here is also therefore a problem of framing from the viewpoint of the analyst. Shils and Young’s view of ‘national communion’ affirms the value consensus of ‘society’ – in this way ‘the society reaffirms the moral values which constitute it as a society’.<sup>308</sup> This circularity aligns the dichotomy of thought and action, and also values/communion and society/individual, by its synthesis in ritual. If we read Durkheim’s view of the analyst’s projection of the world ‘inside of society’ and how ‘the space which this latter occupies becomes confounded with space in general’ we can also see the holism of ‘society’ becoming both Anglocentric (every ‘Englishman’s’ values) and holistic (everyone in this society is taken to be an Englishman).<sup>309</sup> In this context, the use of the word ‘society’ is often synonymous with ‘nation-state’ and thus denotes an unspoken assertion of spatial power and identity.

---

<sup>306</sup> *ibid*, p 62

<sup>307</sup> J G Blumler, J R Brown, A J Ewbank, and T J Nossiter, ‘Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their structure and Development during a ceremonial Occasion’ in *Political Studies* XIX (1971), p 170

<sup>308</sup> E Shils and M Young, ‘The Meaning of the Coronation’, p 80

<sup>309</sup> E Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Free Press: 1965), p 490

The other side of this conceptual coin is that of the recent neo-Marxist analysis of ritual, seen in the invented tradition thesis, in this context, in the work of David Cannadine. Here, ritual does not indicate a unity, but rather illustrates a different meaning of social conflict, and this is what the ritual represents. According to David Cannadine in his essay on monarchy in *The Invention of Tradition*, the period from the 1870s onwards can be seen as development to a different form of monarchy through the elaborate creation of *public* (as opposed to closed court) pageantry as a means of social control and ideology.<sup>310</sup>

Gareth Steadman Jones has critiqued this notion of ‘social control’ as being linked to a functionalist approach that echoes either a psychologistic or biologicistic notion of social integration, and cannot be easily accommodated in a Marxist view of antagonism except as simple reversal.<sup>311</sup> As Jones writes:

The point about these terms is that, although they may register some moral distance from the apologetic complacency of functionalist theory, they in no way break from its theoretical linkages. To say that a functional totality is based on alienation is only to add an epithet of moral or political disapproval.<sup>312</sup>

Jones links this problem with another trope – that of ‘ideal types’ of subjectivity, as in the Lukacsian variety of the ‘revolutionary proletarian’.<sup>313</sup> This makes the temptation to explain history as the deviation away from ideal types, or of seeing the working class as class conscious or not conscious at all, which ultimately leads back to the proletariat as ‘incorporated’ via ‘bourgeois hegemony’ or the mechanisms of ‘social control’. Such theoretical closure serves as a mirror-image to Durkheimian theory of royal ritual, and in no way problematises the ritual as reflective of society, but merely posits it as an opposition to an alternative view of what society is and should be based on similar views of society being represented in ritual.

---

<sup>310</sup> D Cannadine, ‘The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the “Invention of Tradition”, c.1820-1977’ in E Hobsbawm and T Ranger *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983), p 101-164; see also J L Lant, *Insubstantial Ceremony* (H Hamilton: 1979), p 24

<sup>311</sup> G Steadman Jones, *Languages of Class* (Cambridge University Press: 1983), p 84

<sup>312</sup> *ibid*

<sup>313</sup> *ibid*

This can be seen in the notion of ‘invented tradition’ in its hostility toward tradition. The invention of royal ritual was a ‘necessary counterweight to the dangers of popular democracy’, but was also a means by which to stupefy and entertain the working class. Ironically, this view overlaps with that of Walter Bagehot’s classic conservative analysis that it was indeed meant as a way of dazzling the lower orders so that the real business of ‘efficient’ government could change and carry on under the blanket of immemorial rule.<sup>314</sup> Nevertheless, this standpoint retains the tautological problems of ‘social control’ analysis above, which, eventually sees the working classes as under a ‘false consciousness’. It also seems to re-inscribe the power of the mystique of monarchy – it is, implicitly or explicitly, suggested that with its disposal, the British subject would move away from myth and toward rationality – as Christopher Hitchens put it, ‘Illusions, of course, cannot be abolished. But they can and must be outgrown’.<sup>315</sup> As Kuhn sardonically paraphrases this attitude: ‘ceremonies are for women and children, for the uneducated, unwashed and unclean.’<sup>316</sup>

This certainly captures something of the rather unfortunate position of the left-wing intellectual effectively mirroring the attitude of the right wing ‘oppressor’ toward the working class. Cannadine sees Walter Bagehot as being proven right in his view, as expressed in his classic conservative analysis of royalty, that ‘the more democratic we get the more we shall get to like state and show, which have ever pleased the vulgar’.<sup>317</sup> The teleology of ‘removing’ social control so that the ‘real’ rational agents may be revealed is problematic. Because of its being a means of social control, he is only interested in the way this power is materially reflected in the royal ritual. His argument therefore becomes the mirror image of Bagehot’s approving one. Despite using Clifford Geertz as his anthropological authority, ‘deep interpretation’ is for Cannadine effectively a fairly straight-forward Marxist social history. Geertz’s view of representation and interpretation is far more ambivalent of the certainty in meaning

---

<sup>314</sup> W Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (Sussex Academic Press: 1997), p 32

<sup>315</sup> cited in W M Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism* (Macmillan: 1996), p 5

<sup>316</sup> *ibid*

<sup>317</sup> Cannadine, ‘The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual’, p 122; W Bagehot, *The English Constitution*



of such symbols.<sup>318</sup> Cannadine and the invented tradition literature tend to see ritual as also a reflection of society, but unlike Shils and Young as society-as-conflict.

A useful way of going beyond this problem of ritual as representation is in looking at such commentaries as themselves a form of liturgy – that is, of writing *itself* as constructing the meaning of ritual. As Bell notes, the formalisation of Catholic ritual drew upon and created a body of work which attempted to fix the meaning of specific rituals.<sup>319</sup> In this sense the writing itself can be seen as part of the meaning of ritual, as another level of representation of royal ritual, from which meaning is constructed and defined. One can also view newspapers and royal programmes as following this, indicative of a formalisation – or an attempt to ‘fix’ its meaning. Indeed, this can be done as a projection to the future (as a sort of written rehearsal, as in programmes for royal ritual to come) or retrospectively (placing meaning back on the event).

The role of formalisation and traditionalisation as a process is thus important.<sup>320</sup> In anthropological studies, formalisation is usually taken to mean the fixing of rituals over time (such as communion as transubstantiation in Catholic ritual for example).<sup>321</sup> This achieves legitimacy through its antiquity and so depends upon tradition, but this is also the legitimisation posited upon it by the contemporary liturgy of particular times. In the case of the royal ritual this remains the case. While it is certainly true that royal ritual in the modern sense of public (as opposed to closed court ceremony) was ‘invented’ in the late nineteenth century, it is also clear that precedents were avidly sought for royal ceremonials, beginning with the semi-state celebration of the Prince’s survival of illness in 1871 which was linked to the state ceremonial form in George III.<sup>322</sup> In this sense reinvention was the order of the day, and one can often see that some courtly remnants of ceremony remain, but that their perceived meaning has changed, as in this example by Shils and Young on the recognition and presentation of the Queen to the ‘people’ in the 1953 coronation:

The ‘People’ who signify their willingness to do ‘homage and service’ were once the actual members and representatives of the Estates whose participation

---

<sup>318</sup> C Geertz *The Interpretation of Culture* (Hutchinson: 1975)

<sup>319</sup> C M Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford University Press), p 217

<sup>320</sup> *ibid*, p 140

<sup>321</sup> *ibid*, p 217

<sup>322</sup> Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant*, p 25

was necessary for the security of the realm. Now, those within the Abbey, although many of great power stand among them, are no longer its exclusive possessors. The 'homage and service' of the entire society is far more important than it was in earlier Coronations and their offering is no more than a dramatic concentration of the devotion which millions now feel.<sup>323</sup>

This indicates the importance of 'readings of' or commentaries on the royal ritual. There is no sense that anything has changed in the wording or the presentation act itself, but what it symbolises is nevertheless different, because in that context it is read differently. However, the crux of the matter, as in the presentation and recognition of the monarch, is that 'behind the archaic façade was a vital sense of permanent contemporaneity'.<sup>324</sup> It is clear that the past is *both* a legitimisation as continuity and tradition, but is also necessarily reinvented as contemporaneous in this view. In this sleight of hand, the organic connection of past and present within the nation (via national communion) is invoked. The ritual is also placed in stasis as a privileged site where we can view this link of meaning and action within this timeless nation.

As has been noted however this is meaning that is *projected onto* the ritual, rather than what is intrinsic to the ritual in itself. This meaning, as indicated in Shils and Young, is changed in different contexts, but by a sleight of hand unites the past and present of the nation (or 'society'). It is, in this way a sort of secularised liturgy. It is therefore a safer starting point to argue that one can find in the ritual a 'lack' of meaning, which allows such theoretical projection and writing the event. Frits Staal sees ritual as self-contained action that does not in fact contain any meaning.<sup>325</sup> Consequently, 'the only cultural values rituals transmit are rituals'.<sup>326</sup> As Staal notes 'rituals are always guarded jealously and with extreme conservatism. This is directly explained by the theory that ritual has no meaning'.<sup>327</sup> Staal also indicates that 'if ritual is useless this does not imply that it may not have useful side-effects', and accepts that it 'creates a bond between participants, reinforces solidarity, boosts morale and constitutes a link with the ancestors'.<sup>328</sup> Staal accepts this indicates why it is preserved, but notes this does not tell us its origin.

---

<sup>323</sup> Shils and Young, 'The Meaning of the Coronation', p 68

<sup>324</sup> *ibid*

<sup>325</sup> F Staal, 'The Meaninglessness of Ritual' in *Numen* 33, no 2 (1968), p 4, 9

<sup>326</sup> *ibid*, p 8

<sup>327</sup> *ibid*, p 11

<sup>328</sup> *ibid*

However, Staal's work indicates how ritual's meaninglessness becomes bound up with power relations and contestation and it is this aspect, rather than searching for origins, which is useful in his discussion. His position opens up the way in which to ask what ritual *does*, rather than what meanings it reflects. In order to tease this out it is useful to turn to Ernesto Laclau's use of Derridean ideas in relation to hegemony.<sup>329</sup> Derrida points out that 'meaning' and 'knowledge' do not overlap. As Laclau puts it,

something to which no *concept* corresponds (a *that* without a *what*) can still have a *name* – assuming that a function of universal representation consists, in this sense, of widening the gap between the order of naming and that which can be conceptually grasped.<sup>330</sup>

The title of the 'Prince of Wales' and the ritual of 'Investiture' corresponds to this lack of conceptual grasp – a *that* without a *what*. In Laclau's conception, however, it is precisely such 'empty signifiers' as the 'prince of Wales' that allows for hegemonic struggles and relations to occur. Such hegemonic struggles do not occur in a top-down fashion (between England/Wales, state/civil society) but occur immanently from discourses and articulations within society – that is, it is the constitutive gap between 'that' and 'what' that allows for such commentaries and competition for meaning. Moreover, in Laclau's formulation, such named signifiers are given conceptual grasp retroactively, 'depending on contingent hegemonic articulations'.<sup>331</sup> This retroactivity does not allow for full historical closure upon the signifier's meaning to occur – in other words hegemonic relations continue after the event's own constitution, an event (in our view, 'the investiture') does not, in readings upon it, come to 'an end': it remains contested in its meaning.

The traditionalisation of royalty also serves to utilise notions of immemoriality of the nation linked to the middle-ages' view of royal sovereign power. In his discussion of the use of torture as punishment in the middle ages, Foucault describes the King's body as 'a double body...since it involves not only the transitory element that is born and dies, but another that remains unchanged by time and is maintained as the physical yet intangible support of the kingdom.'<sup>332</sup> In the use of the sovereign body in

---

<sup>329</sup> E Laclau, *Identity and Hegemony*, from J Butler, E Laclau, S Zizek *Contemporary, Hegemony, Contingency: Contemporary dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000), p 56

<sup>330</sup> *ibid*

<sup>331</sup> *ibid*, p 57

<sup>332</sup> M Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* (Penguin: 1991), p 28

the public spectacle of twentieth century royal pageantry, this romantic appeal to the nation is reasserted, but the use of different royal symbols invoke assertions of different sentimental nationalisms on this basis. Foucault also notes that the spectacle requires the people, ‘whose real and immediate presence was required for the performance.’<sup>333</sup> The people had ‘to bring its assistance to the king’, but this role was ambiguous, and one of the main points of opposition to the public spectacle of torture was the possibility of disorder.<sup>334</sup> This possibility of going against the authorised script also haunted the Investiture ceremony. Of course, given that Foucault’s view here is of public torture in the middle ages as asserting the power of the sovereign, this may be an indication of what Marx famously added to historical events repeating themselves: ‘the first time as tragedy, the second as farce.’<sup>335</sup>

It is precisely for this reason that the comparison of 1969 is useful in order to look at changed meanings, and to shed light upon what discursive conditions were missing in 1911, as well as how performative power (that is influence arising from the investiture ritual) allows for resistant narratives to become more influential further away in time from the event. This allows us not to simply look at the direct influence of the investiture (which is in any case rather difficult to grasp, for precisely the reasons outlined), but how it is re-written and re-represented in cultural power that is also linked to institutions (e.g. education syllabuses). It is in this way that decentring the event is useful for us to grasp at understanding, and its relevance, as well as its symbolic play and possibilities for subversion.

## **Part 2: The Investiture of the Prince of Wales (1911)**

This section analyses the 1911 investiture, and the processes and techniques of meaning-making in the call and commentary of the event, as well as in the event itself. In this way, we shall study the way that it defines the event as asserting difference, in welsh nationhood, but also in asserting that difference within the wider discourses of empire, as well as how that difference was asserted in feeling and

---

<sup>333</sup> *ibid*, p 57

<sup>334</sup> Foucault *Discipline and Punish*, 58-9

<sup>335</sup> K Marx, ‘The Eighteenth Brumaire of France’ in D McLellan *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* (Oxford University Press: 2000), p 329

sentiment through the use of the royal ritual, which was itself a show which in the end signifies nothing essential. However, it is first useful to briefly outline the development of royal ritual in Britain to the imperial public show it became by the end of the nineteenth century, and the importance of royal ritual in India as a means of developing this show, and in constructing indigenous symbols in relation to the British Empire.

### ***The Development of Royal Pageantry***

It is amusing to note Prince Edward's own reservation on his own sartorial role in the Investiture ceremony, following the attentions of a tailor who was to make 'a fantastic costume designed for the occasion, consisting of white satin breeches and a mantle and surcoat of purple velvet edged with ermine':

I decided things had gone too far. I had already submitted to the Garter dress and robe, for which there existed a condoning historical precedent; but what would my Navy friends say if they saw me in this preposterous rig?<sup>336</sup>

As with many of the debates about the ritual, historical precedent was the issue cited. However, the Queen mollified the Prince, saying that 'as a Prince you are obliged to do certain things that may seem a little silly. It will only be for this once'.<sup>337</sup>

Prior to the 1870s, the role of British pageantry had been small, a fact of which some Englishmen were distinctly proud, seeing pageantry as somewhat beneath them anyway. As an anonymous reporter wrote in 1861:

Some nations have a gift for the ceremonial...But this is generally confined to the people of a southern climate and of non-Teutonic parentage. In England the case is exactly the reverse. We can afford to be more splendid than most nations; but some malignant spell broods over all our most ceremonials, and inserts into them some feature which makes them all ridiculous.<sup>338</sup>

Indeed pageantry in the past in Britain had largely been a mix of farce and incompetence. In George III's funeral William IV was said to have talked loudly throughout the funeral and left early. Victoria's coronation was a litany of

---

<sup>336</sup> Windsor, *A King's Story*, p 220

<sup>337</sup> *ibid*

<sup>338</sup> Cannadine, 'The context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual', p 102

unrehearsed mistakes and a largely frugal affair.<sup>339</sup> Even Victoria's return to public life after mourning the Prince Regent in 1871 was only a show of competence that was designed to eliminate the threat of republicanism.<sup>340</sup>

By contrast, the Imperial Assemblage in India was clearly an elaborate attempt to assert, and represent, British authority and the relation of India to Britain. Following the Indian Mutiny in 1858, investigations had been made into titles in India, bringing under British control the powers of patronage and hierarchising for Indian aristocracy. Indian princes were required to 'prove' by British criteria the legitimacy of their titles.<sup>341</sup> The title of Empress was thus a formalisation of hierarchy, a clear indication that her title was higher than those of the Indian princes (the indigenous language titles – such as maharaja – were those of kings and so formally equal to that of Queen Victoria).<sup>342</sup>

The Assemblage was also to represent the 'native aristocracy' and the naturalised hierarchy of British rule in India. This was conceived as a British feudal order, where 'Indian princes became English knights and should be obedient and offer fealty to the empress'.<sup>343</sup> Lord Lytton had decided on the title 'Imperial Assemblage' rather than a 'darbar', which would invite difficulties of jealousies between princes given that the latter term was used in indigenous ceremonials.<sup>344</sup> As with the Empress herself, the ceremony itself was 'above' Indian tradition. Instead of the exchange of status gifts – gold coins, precious possessions and robes of honour – banners were now to be presented to the princes. These banners were designed by an English civil servant in Bengal who was an amateur heraldist. Thus the 'major present was a representation of the Indian rulers' pasts as represented in their coats of arms'.<sup>345</sup> In Wales, similarly, the title of the 'Prince of Wales' was feudatory, and emphasis was placed on inclusion of Welsh symbols (such as Owain Glyndwr's coat of arms) into the Prince's heralds.

---

<sup>339</sup> *ibid*, p 114-5

<sup>340</sup> J L Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant*, p 25-26

<sup>341</sup> B S Cohn, 'Representing Authority in Victorian India' in E Hobsbawm and T Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983), p 181

<sup>342</sup> *ibid*, p 185

<sup>343</sup> *ibid*, p 191

<sup>344</sup> *ibid*, p 187

<sup>345</sup> *ibid*, p 204

For Lytton, the presentation of the banners (seen as ‘trivial and silly’ by many officials) was necessary to a native aristocracy easily directed as they ‘are easily affected by sentiment and susceptible to the influence of symbols to which facts inadequately respond’.<sup>346</sup> Lytton stated ‘the further East you go the greater the importance of a bit of bunting’. We see here therefore the way symbols are utilised because of their *lack* of correspondence with reality and their represented efficacy to the ‘oriental imagination’. This was particular in the British conception of Indian feudalism, where the Indian peasantry was an ‘inert mass’ obedient to their princes.

Lytton also hoped that it would affect public opinion in Britain, and would act as support to the Conservative government. But it raised considerable hostility, with the fervent imaginings and pageantry still seen as somehow ‘un-English’. Bagehot saw it as interfering with the magic of the monarchy in precisely the way he prohibited.<sup>347</sup> Gladstone called ‘theatrical bombast and folly’ and *The Times* viewed it as ‘tawdry’.<sup>348</sup> ‘Empire’ was not a populist idea – was an irrelevance even – to many liberals, although its rapid expansion over the next two decades ensured this could not continue. The view of pageantry as ‘un-English’ was to change rapidly in this context of expansion, as the reactions of self-love to the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee illustrates:

How many millions of years has the sun stood in heaven? But the sun never looked down upon the embodiment of such energy and power.

[it was] a pageant which for splendour of appearance and especially for splendour of suggestion has never been paralleled in the history of the world.

History may be searched and searched in vain, to discover the so wonderful an exhibition of allegiance and brotherhood amongst so many myriads of men...the mightiest and most beneficial Empire ever known in the annals of mankind.<sup>349</sup>

The English reserve and dislike for spectacle was overcome, and it seems the ‘oriental imagination’ had come to roost at London. This spectacle was clearly linked to the new imperialism, the expansionist view of Empire and the huge expansion of the Empire since 1870. The linking of a Greater Britain was seen in terms of the

---

<sup>346</sup> *ibid*, p 192

<sup>347</sup> J Morris, *Farewell The Trumpets* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: 1978) p 38

<sup>348</sup> *ibid*

<sup>349</sup> *ibid*, p 31

brotherhood of the Empire as well as nation. The British armed forces were on this occasion complemented by imperial troops and regiments, who marched behind them:

There were cavalrymen from New South Wales...Hussars from Canada and Carbiniers from Natal, camel troops from Bikaner and Dyak head-hunters from North Borneo...The seventeen officers of the Indian Imperial Service were all princes, and the Hong Kong Chinese police wore colonial coolie hats. There were Malays, and Sinhalese, and Hausas from the Niger and Gold Coast, Jamaicans in white caps like French gendarmes, Cypriot Zaptiehs whose fezzes struck so jarring a chord that some of the crowd hissed them, supposing them to be Turks...London had never seen such a spectacle. One of the Maoris weighed twenty-eight stone. One of the Dyaks had taken thirteen human heads. It was a properly Roman sight, a pageant of citizens and barbarians too, summoned from the frontiers to that grey eternal city.<sup>350</sup>

As *The Times* put it, it was the ‘first pan-Britannic festival’.<sup>351</sup> The ceremonial bogey and so-called English reserve had been laid to rest in the face of such exuberant exotic spectacle.

### ***The Call for the Investiture of the Prince of Wales***

Prince Edward himself, as do most other commentators and historians, places the re-invention of this pageant as the work of Lloyd George. Edward himself hoped the event ‘would help Papa in his dealings with the difficult Mr Lloyd George’.<sup>352</sup> There was increasing labour strife, a recent fight with the House of Lords on reform as well as the continuing problem of Ireland (whose MPs were props to the Asquith government). Clearly, Lloyd George also fits the bill perfectly as author of the event for the ‘invented tradition’ literature – an early radical nationalist who had become imbued with ‘the manipulative skill of a member of the elite’.<sup>353</sup> On a practical level, one must be suspicious of the supposed instrumental use of the ceremony given that it occurred a mere three weeks after the coronation and its celebrations. Either its usefulness is so limited as to need such constant (monthly!) replenishment, or we need

---

<sup>350</sup> *ibid*, p 32

<sup>351</sup> *ibid*

<sup>352</sup> Windsor, *A King's Story*, p 222

<sup>353</sup> T Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy* (Vintage: 1994), p 219-220.



a different view of ideological power and authorship. Moreover, this is a particular view of Lloyd George, as noted by Kuhn:

The other conspirational politician wheeled out by partisans of the invention of tradition is Lloyd George. He has been connected with the investiture of the Prince of Wales at Caernarvon in 1911, a ceremony which, because it had never been performed before in precisely the way planned for 1911, is often taken as a prime example of an invented tradition. Lloyd George hardly works as an enemy of democracy, at least in this stage of his career when he was a populist advocate of anti-establishment causes<sup>354</sup>

Kuhn further argues that ‘in any case, the idea of a Welsh ceremony originated not with Lloyd George, but with Queen Victoria’s eldest daughter...in discussion with A G Edwards, bishop of St Asaph’.<sup>355</sup> Kuhn, while contradicting his own argument in asserting this point (given that the Bishop of St Asaph is certainly not such a radical figure as Lloyd George and could more easily fit the role of elite conspirator), here relies on the work of John Grigg, who takes A G Edwards’ own words from his memoirs.<sup>356</sup>

As J R Ellis points out in his detailed analysis of the 1911 investiture, this focus on Lloyd George or A G Edwards depends on each of these persons’ own unsubstantiated testimony, and that the discussion left at the highest levels of power misses out far too much in the commentary and meaning-making in the invention of that ceremony.<sup>357</sup> Moreover, such a large focus on ‘authorship’ of the ritual tends to overplay top-down instrumentality rather than seeing the ritual as intertextual, a result of social processes, codes and discourses of nation and empire.

The suggestion for the Investiture of the Prince of Wales, and for that ceremony to take place in Wales, in contrast to most commentaries, was not the sole work of Lloyd George, but was first introduced in the public sphere in an article by Owen Rhoscomyl in the *Western Mail* on the 24<sup>th</sup> of May, 1910, to which there were many responses.<sup>358</sup> Owen Rhoscomyl (the nom de plume of Arthur G Vaughan) had a colourful history of military adventures and was an ardent cultural nationalist, liberal

---

<sup>354</sup> W M Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism*, p 8

<sup>355</sup> *ibid*, p 8

<sup>356</sup> c.f. J Grigg, *Lloyd George: The People’s Champion* (Methuen: 1978), p 303

<sup>357</sup> J R Ellis, *Reconciling the Celt: British National Identity, Empire, and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales* in *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998), p 396

<sup>358</sup> O Rhoscomyl, ‘The Next Prince of Wales – a Solemn Suggestion’, *Western Mail*, 24/5/1910

radical, and imperialist. He had seen war in South Africa, and had married a Boer woman with whom he returned to Wales. He was a well-respected writer on Welsh genealogies and mythic history, and was taken to be an authority on Welsh matters. His historical work in the heroic mould of history, *Flame-Bearers of Welsh History*, was a standard school textbook, and he was a prominent organiser of the Cardiff National Pageant of 1909.<sup>359</sup>

As such, it is worth discussing his original suggestion at some length, as it indicates some disparities from the eventual ceremony, but also some of the concerns which drive the movement for such a ceremony, as well as the themes that underpinned the ritual, and particular commentaries upon it. In this sense it is possible to outline some of our theoretical concerns from Rhoscomyl's discussion, and in particular, how we may use textual strategies, owing to a reading of this proposal not simply as a suggestion for a particular (and detailed) ceremonial, but also in its inscribing at the same time meaning on to that proposed ceremonial. This meaning is not fixed, and it is necessary also to illustrate how Rhoscomyl's description and commentary depends upon rhetorical force (or performative force in its writing) in order to ascribe the meaning he wishes upon it. Following this, we shall indicate some of the themes that arise from the suggestion, and how they subsequently were developed into the final ceremonial, different from that originally envisaged by Rhoscomyl, which he could nevertheless easily support, owing to the inherent meaninglessness of such ritual, and thus the possibility of his projecting his own viewpoint.

### ***Rhoscomyl's Liturgy: Meaning-making and the Investiture***

Rhoscomyl begins by pointing out how the death of Edward VII has opened up the possibility for Wales to take a part in investing her Prince once again, as it had apparently with the son of Edward I after the conquest of 1282, and Edward II was also – according to legend – born in Caernarfon Castle.<sup>360</sup> The historic appeal is continued in the royal descent from the half-Welsh Henry Tudor, and so Wales has a

---

<sup>359</sup> D Smith, *Wales: A Question for History* (Seren: 1999), p 91

<sup>360</sup> O Rhoscomyl, 'The Next Prince of Wales'

special historical interest and right in being allowed the privilege of such an occasion, as

He will be Prince of Wales, even as his father is King of England, by virtue of descent from Harry [Henry] Tudor... So we, of all the kindreds of the Empire, should be most in place in swearing in the Heir-Apparent of the Empire to the first step to his high destiny here on Earth.<sup>361</sup>

This appeal to Henry Tudor as reflecting Welshness at the forefront of Britain would be repeated endlessly in the commentaries on the ritual in general.

He makes several suggestions for what such an investiture would involve symbolically and sartorially, drawing on his views of medieval and Celtic tradition. So, as well as the “gift of the ring” (which he cites in relation to Henry V, or Henry of Monmouth, who was himself thus invested), ‘we could add the golden torques which distinguished the Princes of the Ancient Celts’.<sup>362</sup> This appeal to mythic tradition is not simply an appeal to archaism, however, as he adds ‘and from that we could go on to the things that would bear most weight and carry most pause in the life of Wales to-day’.<sup>363</sup>

The Welsh patriotism of this position should not be in doubt, either, as he calls for ‘a ceremony conducted on truly national lines’. This ceremony he posits as different from that of the coronation (which as noted he identifies with ‘England’, as the crown’s title he sees as ‘King of England’, a remark which would spark some controversy in the *Western Mail*’s letter pages), and this on grounds of radicalism and anti-aristocracy:

The ceremony would open with the Archdruid in full Gorsedd – that of course. But where in the ceremony of George V, it comes to the oath of allegiance from Princes, Peers and prelates, each in their degree, we could substitute the very race itself in the investiture of his son as Prince of Wales.<sup>364</sup>

The ceremonial he sees therefore as being one of the Welsh people as a nation, and implicitly contrasts this democratic view of the ceremony to that of the coronation. One can contrast this viewpoint simply with Shils and Young’s statement of the 1952

---

<sup>361</sup> *ibid*

<sup>362</sup> *ibid*

<sup>363</sup> *ibid*

<sup>364</sup> *ibid*

coronation of Elisabeth II that the persons at Westminster Abbey remain symbolic representatives of the nobility and Church, although these now function in the place of the nation.

It is perhaps in his views on the homage given to the Prince that one finds the clearest example of the democratic appeal, and, despite being significantly different to the final ceremony, it is worth citing at length, in that it allows us to understand Rhoscomyl's writing as a liturgical inscription of meaning to the ceremonial:

three by three we could bring the delegates of each of the masses and the classes who make up our people as we find them. Of the grey shepherds who know the lore and secrets of our ancient mountains, let the three oldest be chosen to come forward first, to pronounce the quiet words which shall tell the lad [i.e. the Prince] how much we hope of him, and to answer any call of his to fight for the right through whatsoever fortune may befall, in the true ancient Cymric spirit, that never would burn its eyes from the vision that it fought for.

And after the grey old shepherds, let the goodly farmers come from hill and dale... Behind them let three colliers come, three quarrymen next, and then three of those sea captains who carry the good name of Wales so high on every sea that rolls. Ploughmen and seamen and coalminers let none of them be forgotten, neither ironworkers nor tin platers be left out. And the 'captains of industry' themselves will be watched by South Walians very closely.

*Then may you go on* to the country gentlemen, three of them as before, to speak for the rest, and three of the constables of our beautiful old castles preceding the mayors of our towns, chairmen of our councils, and lords-lieutenant of our counties, the admirals of the various parts of our costs, and so you may come to the peers in their degrees, before we usher in the delegates of the ministers of the highest things of all, the delegates of the schoolmasters coming with heads of our Churches.<sup>365</sup>

Here we can see much of Rhoscomyl's appeal – the mythic, flowery language and mythologising of sectors of Welsh culture as much as the Prince. The archaism invoked can be seen in the ritualism of the 'three by three', a trope of Welsh mythology. Nevertheless, its modern bent can be seen in its anti-aristocratic and anti-capitalist bent – Rhoscomyl presents his hierarchy as being that of the common man first, the shepherds, colliers and the like, and that in this hierarchy the presumption is that the gentry and the great and the good must wait their turn, which is suggested by the striking phrase 'then may you go on'.

---

<sup>365</sup> *ibid*, emphasis added

Nevertheless, it should be noted that – except for the important actual inclusion of representatives of the lower classes in the act of homage, rather than as spectators (an important fact unrealised in the final ceremony<sup>366</sup>) - this reverse hierarchy is largely rhetorical. If one were to see the ceremony as Rhoscomyl describes, without his commentary, one could just as easily read the hierarchy of the ceremonial as precisely that those who give homage last are most important, and so that the colliers, shepherds et al are in fact at the bottom rung of this hierarchy. This indicates the liturgical nature of writing on the ceremonial which imbues the event with meaning, and one that is based on the rhetorical devices he employs.

Unsurprisingly, despite the *Western Mail's* assertion that there was 'remarkable unanimity' in support of Rhoscymol's suggestion<sup>367</sup> there was also much debate and controversy. This is seen in the letters pages of the *Western Mail* – 'Nationalist' writes, for example, in support of the strengthening of the intimate relation between prince and principality and 'the assertion of the strength of the sentiment of Welsh nationality', two stock phrases which would over the course of the following year be repeated ad nauseam becoming either a consensus view or a cliché.<sup>368</sup>

There were also some dissenting voices – some against the whole idea of the Investiture, some supportive but questioning the historical legitimacy given to it. It is on the question of history that strength of feeling asserts itself, rather as a repetition of the debates between Welsh and English historians about the Galfridian myth in the sixteenth century. W M Graham-Easton writes on Rhoscomyl's suggestion that it is proof that 'Celts cannot treat history without perverting it'.<sup>369</sup> The writer goes on to state his opposition to the ceremony on the basis that 'in these imperialist days I know of no valid reason why he should be created by the separatist-savouring title of Prince of Wales, which is not a title of peerage, but feudatory'.<sup>370</sup> Other historical objections were made against the so-called 'Caernarvon baby story' used by Rhoscomyl as legitimisation, which another letter writer, supportive of the Investiture, describes as an

---

<sup>366</sup> While the liberal miners' leader William Abraham – better known as Mabon – was to play a small part as representative of labour he withdrew under pressure from other labour leaders, in particular Keir Hardie.

<sup>367</sup> *Western Mail*, 25/5/1910

<sup>368</sup> *Western Mail*, 28/5/1910

<sup>369</sup> Letter, *Western Mail* 28/5/1910

<sup>370</sup> *ibid*

‘old wives’ tale’, stating that using such myths and ‘extravagances’ was tantamount to lack of self-respect.<sup>371</sup> This particular story is of vital importance because it was the main claim to historical legitimacy of the ultimately successful bid by Caernarfon over Cardiff to stage the event.

While many of the objections to Rhoscomyl’s suggestion had been on the basis of history, these were also disputes over historical symbols or myth. Certainly the debates on Henry Tudor reasserted his alleged role as British-Welsh and so the centrality of the Welsh effort in British history via the Tudors. The Bosworth myth clearly fitted the wishes to identify Wales with the British crown (to-be), nation and Empire, and it was one which was continually asserted, and the Prince’s legitimacy was made through descent from Henry Tudor.

However there were other symbolic figures who certainly did not fit quite so easily, such as Owain Glyndwr, and Llywelyn the Last, both of whom had rebelled against the English Crown.<sup>372</sup> These also had to be reconciled symbolically, in part because the ceremonial was also an assertion of Welsh nationality, and needed to encompass such heroic figures. This was a difficult balancing act, and the Lord Mayor of Cardiff fell off this tightrope and effectively sealed the Investiture for Caernarfon when he was accused by the English press of praising only the figures of insurrection as authentically Welsh. This reconciliation was achieved symbolically, and by arguments on highly spurious grounds that the Welsh investiture ceremony was originally a Celtic ceremony, and so could be reconciled with the English prince, who was an inheritor to a Welsh Celtic tradition. Glyndwr’s herald was to be included for the first time on the standard of the Prince of Wales, linking this Welsh rebellion to a reconciliation of the English and Welsh in the ritual act itself.<sup>373</sup>

---

<sup>371</sup> J W Langestaff, Letter to *Western Mail*, 1/6/1910

<sup>372</sup> Llywelyn the Last was the last Welsh Prince, and was killed in 1282, heralding the conquest of Wales by the English King Edward I, who then built a network of castles across North Wales. Owain Glyndwr was a Welsh rebel who rebelled against Henry IV at the beginning of the fifteenth century, initially with great success. He is glorified for the sitting of a Welsh Parliament in Machynlleth, and for his plans to set up a Welsh University.

<sup>373</sup> *Souvenir of the Investiture of H R H Prince of Wales, Carnarvon Castle July 13th 1911* (Valentine & Sons Ltd, Dundee, London and Montreal), p 21

This balancing act also entailed the choice of venue. Caernarfon Castle had never fallen to the Welsh, even to Glyndwr's rebellion. Moreover it had been built by Edward the Conqueror after Llywelyn's defeat as an English stronghold and a royal town. It was therefore attacked in the bid for Cardiff as an unhappy symbol of oppression. However, this opinion was never politicised beyond a role in competition for the privilege of hosting the investiture, and was always indicated as reflecting past history which the ritual would reconcile.

Such attacks on the suitability of the site required a quick reversal when Caernarfon won the bid. One approach was to praise Edward I's diplomacy as well as his military acumen by presenting his child to the Welsh. The historical debate about the baby legend was essentially put aside and dismissed as irrelevant and against national sentiment. In a characteristically Edwardian sentiment, the *Western Mail* stated that 'iconoclastic historians have, to their own satisfaction, proved the pretty story to be nothing more than tradition', but it was 'far more comfortable' to forget 'divergent views' and succumb to the 'simple faith of tradition, which has been gospel to thousands'.<sup>374</sup> The castle was the ideal setting for the 'historic pageant' as any imagination can:

reconstruct one of the most picturesque incidents of our history. But we must be careful not to allow the field of our imagination to be curtailed by those dry-as-dust historians who misuse their brains and waste their time in trying to take all the colour out of the nation's story. We must be steeped in the legends of the place, shutting our ears resolutely to the voices which tell us that none of the picturesque incidents which we have been taught were connected with the birth of the first Prince of Wales is true.<sup>375</sup>

Nothing could get in the way of this sentiment and picturesque, as even 'several old homes that have hitherto blocked the view have been demolished'.<sup>376</sup> The imagery of a romantic traditional Celticism which placed sentimental above utilitarian conditions won out also in the eventual decision, following bitter exchanges, for Caernarfon castle, and not Cardiff to site the event. Given the romanticism and sentiment of Rhoscomyl's suggestion (for all his assertion that it was based on practicalities and modernity), once the choice had become calcified between Cardiff, prosperity and

---

<sup>374</sup> *Western Mail*, 13/7/1911

<sup>375</sup> *ibid*

<sup>376</sup> *ibid*

urban modernity on the one hand, and Caernarfon, the picturesque and rural romanticism on the other, such an outcome was close to inevitable.

It was also necessary to present the ritual itself as a proof of victory over historical English oppression. Rhoscomyl sees the need to dismiss the phrase ‘magnificent badge of our subjection’ in relation to the castle as site of the Investiture, and view it instead as ‘a splendid witness to the unquenchable fire of the Welsh for freedom’.<sup>377</sup> Moreover, in the ceremonial itself the Glyndwr standard finally entered the castle as it had failed to do so five hundred years before:

And so the flag of Welsh nationalism, which could not get entrance to Caernarvon Castle then, was brought into a place of honour to grace the triumph of Welsh nationalism to-day!<sup>378</sup>

This indicates clearly the way a site can be reinterpreted according to the needs of the ritual – even the most colonial of sites can be reconstructed as a model for reconciliation, and a way to celebrate the Welsh’s survival.

The way in which these themes are linked symbolically into a spirit of both reconciliation and insurrectionary nationalism are to be seen in ‘Glyndwr: The Investiture Historical Play’, performed to a packed house twice in Caernarfon during the week of the Investiture, and receiving good reviews.<sup>379</sup> How Glyndwr is linked to ritual and its Welsh national narrative is of importance here. The character of the Prince of Wales, Henry (who would become Henry V, hero of Agincourt) is completely unblemished in the play – even in the first act, he stands up independently for the justice of Glyndwr’s cause.<sup>380</sup> This is rather different to the King himself, Henry IV, who follows the course given him by his advisers in judging against Glyndwr because he is a Welshman.<sup>381</sup> When, in the third act, the king is ready to negotiate, the act of reconciliation required by the Welsh is to kneel before his son in a ceremony of Investiture. This is unproblematic to the Welsh for the Prince is someone toward whom the ‘Welsh heart is warm’ (‘Mae calon Cymru’n gynnes ato

---

<sup>377</sup> *Western Mail*, 14/7/1911

<sup>378</sup> *Western Mail*, 14/7/1911

<sup>379</sup> *Baner ac Amserau Cymru*, 12/7/1911

<sup>380</sup> G Beriah Evans, *Glyndwr: The Investiture Historical Play* (B G Evans: 1911), p 33

<sup>381</sup> *ibid*



ef).<sup>382</sup> This is a reference to the fact that Henry V was the prince who provided a vague precedent for the Investiture ceremony, and so it was vital he be accommodated.

However, the play ends, not with the Investiture of the future Henry V, but with the coronation of Glyndwr himself at Machynlleth. Glyndwr is thus symbolically linked to the Investiture the same week as the performance, and many of the same props and paraphernalia are to be found in the staged version of Glyndwr's 'investiture', such as the sword, the rod and the crown.<sup>383</sup> Leading up to this moment, Glyndwr has already explicitly been linked to the 'Tudor race' (whose rule begins the best part of a century later than Glyndwr's rebellion), via his link as another of Merlin's 'sons of prophecy'. He is also linked to present concerns of Welsh nonconformism and cultural nationalism when he cries 'Freedom for Wales! Freedom for all! A Free Nation! A Free Education! A Free Church!'<sup>384</sup> It is not uncommon for the Glyndwr symbol to be used to reflect particular Welsh causes and selves at this time – O M Edwards, for example, could view Glyndwr in these terms:

Owen Edwards created a new Glyn Dwr, a hero formed on the model of the democratic and liberal image... Thus was Glyn Dwr metamorphosed into the defender of the ordinary man against the oppression of the landlords, into a kind of fifteenth century Tom Ellis, into a politician who tried to set up in Wales a university and an independent Church, in fine, into the upholder of those very ideals which the common people of the nineteenth century fought so tenaciously to realise. This Glyn Dwr could most fittingly fill the post of the first president of the University College at Aberystwyth...<sup>385</sup>

This was the model of Glyndwr seen in the Play. This movement allows Glyndwr to be reconciled as both an insurrectionary figure and a man of peace, and allows him to state the meaning of the Investiture to the audience in his closing speech:

Oh! My Country! My Country! How high may you be amongst the nation of the earth if your children were always pure to one another and loyal to their leaders! (*turns to the audience*) All loyal Welsh comrades! Treachery has failed and always will! Pure patriotism, true loyalty, now put fire in all our hearts! While Wales is loyal to herself – and her God – no enemy can defeat

---

<sup>382</sup> *ibid*, p 104

<sup>383</sup> *ibid*, p 130

<sup>384</sup> *ibid*, p 66

<sup>385</sup> D Glyn Jones, 'His Politics' In A R Jones & Gwyn Thomas (eds) *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (Cardiff: 1973), p 53

her! Wales was highly praised in times gone by. She will be again in the times to come! After the storm, comes sunshine; after the winter, summer; after war, peace. The day is coming, and I see its dawn yonder, when the Englishman and Welshman shall walk together in peace and full concert, without violence, nor treachery, nor blood – and both ensuring the health and the success of their country.

O! Fy Ngwlad! Fy Ngwlad! Pa mor uchel y gallaset fod ymhlith cenhedloedd daear pe buasai dy blant bob amser yn bur i'w gilydd ac yn ffyddlon i'w harweinwyr! (*yn troi drachefn at y gynulleidfa*) Gyd-Gymru ffyddlon oll! Fe fethodd brad, a methu wna! Gwladgarwch pur, ffyddlondeb gwir, a dania mwyach ein calonnau oll! Tra Cymru'n ffyddlon iddi ei hun – a'i Duw – ni all un gelyn darostwng hi! Bu Cymru'n fawr ei chlod mewn oesoedd gynt. Bydd eto'n uwch ei bri yr oesau ddaw! Ar ol y storm, daw heulwen; ar ol y gaeaf, haf; ca wedi rhyfel heddwch, - a llwydd i Gymru fad! Mae'r dydd yn dod, a gwelaf ef yn gwawrio draw, ca'r Sais a'r Cymro drigo yn gytun mewn hedd a chydgorod llawn, heb drais, na brad, na llid, - a'r ddau yn ceisio lles a llwydd ei wlad.<sup>386</sup>

Insurrectionary symbols of nationalism required the placing of reconciliation with their English masters here in a wholly Welsh setting, as in the Investiture itself which was attended almost wholly by Welshmen. Significantly, however, the message here is also an appeal to 'Britishness', to loyalty to the Crown, and also to an imperial mission, which requires the symbolic reconciliation of the Welsh and the English's messy shared history.

## ***Empire, Difference and Unity***

The role of the Investiture in relation to Empire can be clearer seen in the more detailed points made by the Cymmrodorion Society in Cardiff in their petition on the matter to the Lord Mayor of Cardiff ten days after Rhoscymol's original suggestion:

Since most men agree-

- (1) that we all gain or lose by the respect or neglect felt for the land we live in by the other parts of the Empire;
- (2) that it is in the interest of the people of England, Scotland, Ireland, and the lands across the sea that Wales should be thoroughly realised to its position in the Empire of to-day, so that it may gird itself to come to

---

<sup>386</sup> G Beriah Evans, *Glyndwr*, p 133

the front of all that helps the Empire to be steadfast to the highest and strongest ideals;

- (3) That anything which may help to bring the people of the land together in common effort and common desire is a step towards the goal;
- (4) That, therefore, the proposed Investiture of the Prince of Wales in Wales will furnish a present occasion for the happiest union and endeavour, and a future means of continuing and strengthening that unity through the years by establishing a centre of touch for us all in the person and dignity of a Prince of Wales known and rejoiced in by all our people;
- (5) That this should be to the benefit of both Prince and people, bringing them together in every aspiration and endeavour for the honour of Wales and the good and glory of the whole of the Empire;

Resolved, therefore, that we request the Lord Mayor of Cardiff to convene a public meeting to set on foot a petition to the King, praying that his son shall be solemnly and ceremonially invested Prince of Wales in Wales when the time shall come for him to ascend to that degree and honour.<sup>387</sup>

This petition clearly puts the position in relation to the United Kingdom and the wider Empire, with the unity of the nation in the figure of the prince also a symbol of wider unity and of Wales coming ‘to the front’ of the Empire. The Investiture would not simply be good for the unity of Wales to bring together its common desire, but also therefore a due recognition and respect of Wales’ contribution to the Empire, leading to the ‘good and glory of the whole of the Empire’. As Rhoscomyl put it:

Welsh nationalism is the determination to bring Wales to the front in the Empire in every way that offers. Welsh Nationalism is the spirit which first recognises all that Wales has to make up, in spite of the progress of the last generation, and then stubbornly sets itself to help in bringing Wales at least abreast of the rest, ready to helping her to outstrip them, if that be possible. Nationalism believes that Wales has a distinct and definite value to bring to the Empire and to the world, in all things where mere numbers do not count.<sup>388</sup>

In its grandiose ambitions for the Investiture, one detects also an implicit sense of inferiority. In calling for the need for ‘respect’ – in contrast to ‘neglect’ – one is struck by the stark choice between the two which the petition appears to feel that the wider world (Empire) accords Wales, and that the need for the ceremonial is both meant as a recognition of the achievement of that respect but also ‘a step towards the goal’ – in other words it switches between the present tense and the ‘to-be’ after the ceremonial. In this sense one can see the similarities between this viewpoint and the

---

<sup>387</sup> cited in Western Mail, 13/7/1911

<sup>388</sup> *ibid*

neo-Durkheimian position of Shils and Young outlined in the first section, whereby the ceremonial both provides proof of the deep moral consensus *and* constructs it.

Given that the Investiture also marked the link between duty of the governing and governed within Empire, one can see that Rhoscomyl's nationalism easily encompassed militarism. This is in fact unsurprising, and can be seen in his book, *Flame-Bearers of Welsh History*, which, according to John Rhys's preface aimed to work against the notion that the Welsh 'are not hares ready to run away at the first approach of an enemy, that on the contrary they were always ready to fight and to fight obstinately even when the numbers against them were overwhelming. He is of the opinion that justice has hardly been done them in this matter'.<sup>389</sup>

Nevertheless there is clearly a feeling that the Welsh are in need of a good dose of militarism and imperialism, as can be seen in D Lleufer Thomas' assessment on the significance of the Investiture (one of many of the great and the good asked by the *Western Mail* in their Investiture edition):

Membership of a church or even a party is far more a real thing to most people than their membership of the State, of the nation, of the Commonwelath. The latter is too often regarded – is it not? – as something quite apart from, and set even against, the individual as some body foreign, if not antagonistic, to himself, and not as some body of which he himself is an integral part...its formal recognition of our nationhood should also help us to realise that we have to work out our special mission as a nation in relation to the world of thought and the life of other nations.<sup>390</sup>

It is possible to link this to the *Western Mail*'s assessment of the need for boy scouts and young volunteer forces:

These are, indeed, the days of the young. Never before were there such abundant opportunities for enabling them to make the most of their powers – to develop muscle; to be at the same time trained and disciplined and led to exercise their initiative...to be enabled to rid themselves of namby-pambyism...the movement tends to a sturdier character and more efficient brains, as well as a stronger physique. Without being in any real sense military, it is in the highest degree patriotic.<sup>391</sup>

---

<sup>389</sup> J Rhys *Preface* in O M Rhoscomyl *Flame-Bearers of Welsh History* (Merthyr Tydfil: 1905)

<sup>390</sup> *Western Mail* 3/7/1910

<sup>391</sup> *Western Mail*, 27/5/1910

Again we see militarism and its collapse into citizenship and nationalism. However, there is a clear feeling of the need to fight against this ‘namby-pambyism’, linked to social Darwinist fears of ‘national deterioration’ following the Boer War.<sup>392</sup> This can be seen in the commentary on the royal ritual. It oscillates between a view of the ritual as *both* a reflection of the Welsh as loyal empire-builders, and equal deserving partners in the enterprise, but also a means of *making this so*, which in turn depends on a deep ambivalence and ambiguous position that goes to the heart of commentary on ritual, which tends to ask ‘what is the ritual a reflection of?’ and ‘what does it do?’, to which the answer is to allow space for commentaries of uncovering what ‘real’ Welsh identity is and should be; both of these at the same time.

The role of Welsh nationalism was to secure the Welsh a deserving position in that Empire, one of equal partnership with the other British Isles nations, and in particular England. As the *Western Mail* put it, ‘With Englishmen, Scotsmen and Irishmen we are joint heirs to the Empire, joint servitors in the great task of maintaining and developing that heritage.’<sup>393</sup> The aim here is also to re-establish the role of Wales in an Empire that should not be regarded as ‘English’, this in fact being a Welsh liberal bugbear, as seen in the journal of the Cymru Fydd home-rule movement:

We Welshmen, then, must banish from our midst the wretched and degrading heresy of Little Englandism...and we must set about teaching our English friends the very elementary fact that our common Empire is Anglo-Celtic and not Anglo-Saxon; and that the term *British* (and not English) must be the general, as well as the official, designation of all imperial institutions.<sup>394</sup>

In this context, difference was seen as positive and nourishing to the Empire. It is thus that the link between ‘local’ nationalism and the Empire could be reconciled.

‘Indigenous’ elements of the ceremony recall those of the Indian Durbars. The internal ceremony and homage to the prince by a select few followed by the dramatic presentation to the masses is almost identical to the Indian Princes’ homage to the king in a dais followed by their presentation to the masses, as is the highly ordered military camp to accommodate the territorials according to their divisions. Such

---

<sup>392</sup> G R Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought 1899-1914* (University of California Press: 1971), p 60

<sup>393</sup> *Western Mail*, 14/7/1911

<sup>394</sup> *Young Wales*, V (1900) p 52

elements all had their precedents, and so one need not necessarily seek authorship, but rather see this element as intertextual with royal pageantry in general.

Despite being derivative of other royal rituals, the commentary upon the Investiture could still assert its Welshness. This was largely because apart from their majesties and a few grandees (noticeably Winston Churchill, and the Leader of the Opposition), the whole of the ceremony and its audience were Welsh. But the reading of its symbolism could be stretched very easily to encompass a separatedness, because of this being the investiture of the Prince of Wales in the Principality of Wales, and it is interesting to note that commentaries upon the Investiture often contrast it with the Coronation of the previous week – the coronation in England ‘represents for England what the investiture does for Wales’.<sup>395</sup> In this sense, the commentaries illustrate a certain conception of difference and particularity of Wales as well as linking to the ‘universality’ of Empire. There was in this context, and despite some unionist qualms, no need of an assertion of Welsh nationality separate from Britishness, but only as separate from English as equal partners in an ‘Anglo-Celtic’ Empire.

### ***Sentiment and Romanticism in the Edwardian Period***

In his classic work on the Edwardian period, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*, Samuel Hynes views the decline of Liberalism in this period not simply as political – that is in being squeezed from the right and the left by the Conservatives and Labour – but also as a failure of the imagination and in the field of culture. Ultimately, the problem lies in the fact that while commentary would be acute on the social problems of the age, there was a lack of imagination as to the solutions, which tended to fall into ideas of a sort of religious revival and of sentimentality. Hynes focuses on the work of two exemplifiers of this approach – C F G Masterman and John Galsworthy. Hynes states of Masterman:

Masterman could write movingly on the things that moved him...but his emotions were not directed toward action; they were, apparently, sufficient in themselves. If he wrote feelingly about the urban poor, he wrote in the same

---

<sup>395</sup> *Western Mail*, 14/6/1911

mood about the decline of the rural peasantry, and in each case the burden of his argument was not reform but decent feelings.<sup>396</sup>

A similar point is made of Galsworthy – he ‘believed in a social conscience, he said, but he believed in it only as an emotion; he thought sentiment could be a civilizing force – perhaps the only civilizing force’.<sup>397</sup> In this way, the Edwardian period was more a ‘period of reformists than of reform’.<sup>398</sup>

It is this emotional sentimentality that we can see repeated in the Welsh royal ritual, and in its commentaries upon it, as limiting Welsh nationalism itself. Despite some radical *sentiments*, Rhoscomyl’s own suggestion is completely trapped in this idea of feeling and particularly the comradely feeling of ‘feeling Welsh’ that does not lead to any link to his practical proposals. The ritual, so the commentaries overwhelmingly state, will bring the nation together in an orgy of sentimental feeling that would transcend politics and lead *in itself* to a raising of Welsh prestige through pageantry, and unity through ceremony. While claiming to be practical, the ritual in fact is written as more ‘real’ than practical ideas such as home-rule. The problem in Rhoscomyl is precisely to see the ritual in terms of reflecting ‘society’, which leads to him reading it as reflecting Celticism, and this interpretation itself constructs that identification. He, and others, could view the ritual as eminently ‘practical’ because of their view of the importance of sentiment and romanticism to the Celtic imagination which displaced everyday realities to the pursuit of something higher, something which was seen as serving Welsh needs more than anything as prosaic as social or political change.

As K O Morgan states of the confidence and optimism of Welsh nationalism at this period, ‘Matthew Arnold’s analysis of the superior intuitive qualities of the Celt in contrast to the more prosaic virtues of the steadier Saxon had found its ultimate fulfilment’, but this identification had its own inherent limitations.<sup>399</sup> Essentially, the point of the cultural superiority of Celts did not move away from a view that its place was in antiquity and passions, and that they lacked the modern and rational ability to govern. Despite Rhoscomyl’s arguments for Cardiff as a centre of modernity and his

---

<sup>396</sup> S Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (Princeton: 1969), p 68

<sup>397</sup> *ibid.*, p 85

<sup>398</sup> *ibid.*, p 56

<sup>399</sup> K O Morgan, *Rebirth of A Nation* (Oxford: 1998), p 121

protests to the contrary, the rhetoric he deploys was clearly in line with the picturesque Celticism of rural pasture. This exemplar of sentimental Celticism was precisely what would lead to the loss to Welsh liberal cultural nationalism of the working vote, as the Labour Party grew in strength.

Similarly, Empire is invoked in this sentimental structure of feeling and linked to this unity and prestige. However, imperialism, as in Galsworthy, emerges only in the form of sentiment, as a unifying force of ‘imperial feeling’ with nothing in the way of what imperialism in practical terms means. In this sense, Rhoscomyl’s original idea, for all its *rhetorical* radicalism, once re-written and substituted by the protocols, tropes and leitmotifs of royal ritual (to which he himself has no opposition) could quite easily accommodate views of imperialism, and was of course in no way inimical to them. The point of Welsh sentiment is therefore to *feel* a part of the Empire which is intrinsically bound with a national feeling of deserved partnership with the rest of Britain. The royal ritual, given a separate symbolic role in Wales to the coronation, often contrasted to it as ‘Welsh’ to that ritual’s ‘Englishness’ is intrinsically bound to that Empire, but also an assertion of difference within it.

The Celticism and antiquity invoked in the ceremony serves as a reminder of Celticism rooted in antiquity, along with Arnoldian notions of Celticism that locks feelings of Welshness with the ritualistic traditionalism and sentimentality of the Investiture ceremony as a mummified and fixed stereotype. This serves to displace ideas of imperialism to the positive mission of the Welsh, along with the rest of Britain to the service of mankind in the Empire. Nevertheless, the placing of a separate royal ritual in Wales would allow for spaces of alternative articulations of Welshness in relation to royalty and Britishness, as well as to re-readings of the medievalism and site of the ceremony. In order to understand how this happens it is necessary to look at the repetition of the same ceremony almost fifty years later, in 1969.

### **Part 3: The Investiture of the Prince of Wales as Re-run: the 1969 Investiture and its post-colonial reading.**



In 1958, the Queen stated that her son, Charles, would be invested and ‘presented’ to the Welsh people once he had come of age.<sup>400</sup> It appears that the Labour government under Harold Wilson were particularly keen on this pledge’s fruition. It has largely been read as a response by the governing Labour party to the rapid growth in Welsh nationalism in the 1960s following Gwynfor Evans’s election to the Carmarthenshire seat in 1966.<sup>401</sup> According to many polls, no Labour seat was safe from the Plaid Cymru threat, and this was confirmed in 1968 when Phil Williams came within less than two thousand votes of toppling the safe Labour seat in Caerphilly after the largest swing against a government since the Second World War.<sup>402</sup> Political protest was also organised and militant, under non-violent but often unconstitutional means under the umbrella of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg* (Welsh Language Society), and under the by turns rather farcical and violent forms of the Free Wales Army.

The investiture was particularly linked with George Thomas, later Lord Tonybandy, in the minds of those who were anti-Investiture, who saw in the Welsh Secretary a particularly anti-Welsh language feeling and demagoguery.<sup>403</sup> Opposing the investiture was seen as an electoral trap by Plaid Cymru moderates. As Dafydd Wigley later wrote:

Roedd yn hanfodol bwysig i’r Blaid beidio a disgyn i’r trap a osodwyd inni gan George Thomas, yr Ysgrifennyddol Gwladol. Gwyddai ef sut byddai adwaith ffyrnig gan y blaid yn pechu yn erbyn trwch y pleidleiswyr a hoffai syrcas...Y peth hanfodol oedd cadw’n llygad ar ein nod – ennill y sedd, ac ennill ymreolaeth.<sup>404</sup>

[It was vitally important for the party not to fall into the trap set for us by George Thomas, the Welsh Secretary. He knew that a furious reaction by the party would alienate the majority of the electorate who enjoy a circus...The necessary thing was to keep our eye on the prize – to win the seats, and gain self-government.]

But the policy certainly split the nationalist movement, with the tide of younger protesters joining *Cymdeithas yr Iaith* also in rejecting ‘responsible’ constitutionalism that had characterised earlier cultural efforts. Nevertheless, given that *Cymdeithas*

<sup>400</sup> T Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass*, p 225

<sup>401</sup> K Morgan, *Rebirth of a Nation*, p 386

<sup>402</sup> D Gwynn, ‘Arwisgiad 1969: Yr Ymateb Gwleidyddol’, in *Cof Cenedl XX (Gomer: 2000)* p 163-5

<sup>403</sup> D Phillips, ‘Hanes Cymdeithas yr Iaith 1962-1998’ in G H Jenkins and M A Williams (ed) *‘Eu Hiaith a Gadwant’?: Y Gymraeg yn yr Ugeinfed Ganrif* (Caerdydd: 2000), p 458

<sup>404</sup> D Wigley, *Dal Ati* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1993), p 93

were a single-issue group, with their civil disobedience directed at such reforms as bilingual forms, action toward the investiture would, as will be seen, be controversial as a move that was 'too political' in a more general sense.

Once again, antiquity and tradition were invoked in the Investiture. Francis Jones, Herald Extraordinary, compiled a detailed genealogy of the Prince of Wales's ancestry, not only to Harry Tudor, but through him to ancient Welsh princes and even to Owain Glyndwr.<sup>405</sup> This is a repetition of 1911's attempt at reconciling these figures symbolically, but this time through the blood of the Prince himself. Moreover, the heralds accompanying the ceremony utilised several signs from Welsh tradition, so that the ceremony's inclusion of Wales was in no doubt. To bolster its scientific genealogy, the College of Arms announced also (as though there were doubts) that the motto on the Prince of Wales's coat of arms 'Ich Dein' was the German for 'I serve' rather than the Welsh 'Eich Dyn' ('Your Man').<sup>406</sup> Again, therefore, Welsh symbols were used as legitimising the title of the Prince, and the reasons for the ceremony were again similar. They would both reflect and further tie the Prince and people of the principality in a sacred bond, or failing that, would split the nationalist rank and file.

One crucial difference was the lessening role of Empire and militarism. Ironically, given the threat of terrorism, there were only 2,500 territorial soldiers in Caernarfon, in comparison with 12,000 in 1911. Careful consideration was made toward crowd control barriers (a brochure for different models remain in Caernarfon corporation archives) and the Chief Constable ordered increased police presence (2,500) explicitly due to the 'paucity' of military presence.<sup>407</sup> This lessening of the role of militarism is clearly linked to the vast retreat of British territorial Empire since 1911, and the changing focus to the audience 'outside' Britain is now linked to tourism rather than to grandeur and the prestige of Wales within that Empire. The other military symbol was Charles's dispensation to wear his regiment's ceremonial trousers, undoubtedly

---

<sup>405</sup> F Jones, *Princes and Principality of Wales* (University of Wales Press), p 32-47

<sup>406</sup> *ibid*; commentators had used this idea of 'eich dyn' in 1911 with tongues firmly in cheek, so it is comical to note that this was lost to 'scientific' minds in 1969.

<sup>407</sup> Caernarfon Archives: minutes of informal meeting, 15/2/1968

with some relief not having to undergo the embarrassment of Edward's tight white satin breeches.<sup>408</sup>

Lord Snowdon, the constable of Caernarfon Castle, husband of Princess Margaret, and photographer, was entrusted with providing the spectacle for the vast satellite linked audience around the world (it was one of two that month – the other being the moon landing).<sup>409</sup> Funds for the event were capped at £200,000 (including street works and so on), and in response to the attacks on expense, George Thomas pointed out that it was a sound investment for tourism.<sup>410</sup> The changing relation between the world's economic powers can be seen in the numerous reports in the newspapers of American tourists' responses to the pageantry, and that attention was given to the main foreign dignitaries who were failed presidential candidate Hubert Humphrey and President Nixon's daughter (in the *Chester Chronicle*'s words, '[local bus company] Crossville had never carried such distinguished passengers').<sup>411</sup> A spectacle of prestige and grandiose power to the outside world was now the kitsch tourist spectacle to which we are now more accustomed.

But perhaps the most important and oft-utilised legitimisation was the personality of the Prince himself. Richard Cawston's television documentary 'The Royal Family' had already shown the mundanities of the Royal household and 'presented' Charles to the people already, and several interviews had presented an intelligent and likeably self-deprecating young man.<sup>412</sup> The importance of the prince's personality is important precisely because of the 'empty signifier' of his title – this is made more so by the fact that he was already addressed as 'Prince of Wales' since his birth, and so the Investiture 'invested' him with a title he already possessed. This can be seen in writings that praise Prince Charles in the unsurprisingly hagiographical 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary souvenir pamphlet of Charles's investiture, where particular praise is given to his personal qualities in forging his own identity and role in a title that denies

---

<sup>408</sup> North Wales Chronicle: Investiture Supplement (1969), p xi

<sup>409</sup> *ibid*

<sup>410</sup> E Hughes, *The Prince the Crown and the Cash* (Housmans: 1969), p 28, 32

<sup>411</sup> Rex Thelwall, *Chester Chronicle: Investiture souvenir edition* (1969)

<sup>412</sup> T Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass*, p 217

him a constitutional one.<sup>413</sup> This necessity for personality is also of course why the prince is particularly vulnerable to scandal and personal attacks.

These personal qualities were important in his professed love of Wales and in his spending a term at Aberystwyth University, where he was taught Welsh by a prominent member of Plaid Cymru. Unlike his uncle before him, he was thus adept in addressing the Welsh crowds in Welsh. Moreover, in interviews, his self-deprecation also attracted sympathy and he coyly played the victim of circumstances beyond his control, and reached out to ‘his’ detractors:

As long as I don’t get covered too much in egg and tomato, I’ll be all right. I don’t blame people demonstrating like that. They’ve never seen me before. They don’t know what I’m like. I’ve hardly been to Wales, and you don’t expect people to be overzealous about the fact of having a so-called English Prince come amongst them.<sup>414</sup>

The personal touch here is quite marked, and subtly gives the idea that the nationalist fringes would be fine if they knew ‘what I’m like’. The reference to the ‘so-called English prince’ is clearly a reference to the Herald Extraordinary’s genealogy of his distant Welsh roots.<sup>415</sup> Sympathy was directed toward the prince from many quarters – even critics of the investiture could point out that it was ‘cruel’ to send him to Caernarfon, Emlyn Hughes MP flippantly calling for the ‘Prevention of Cruelty to the Prince of Wales’.<sup>416</sup>

His learning of the Welsh language was also a trump-card. Many newspapers opined that he had done more for the Welsh language in the past year than the nationalists had accomplished in years of protest, and that his example had created a deluge of enrolments in Welsh classes.<sup>417</sup> Prominent members of Plaid Cymru similarly praised the prince as an example.<sup>418</sup> This position pointed to Plaid Cymru’s problem – in effect they were squeezed from outside the national movement by wishing to stay electorally respectable, and from their own ranks by a perceived subservience to (English) royalty. They were also caught in a bind by their own constitutional policy,

---

<sup>413</sup> D Keay in G Thomas, ‘I Serve’, p 30

<sup>414</sup> cited in T Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass*, p 224

<sup>415</sup> F Jones, *The Princes and the Principality*, p 32-47

<sup>416</sup> E Hughes, *The Prince, the Crown and the Cash*, p 39

<sup>417</sup> Rex Thelwall, *Chester Chronicle: Investiture Souvenir Edition* (1969)

<sup>418</sup> D Gwynn, ‘Yr Arwisgiad’, p 171

in that they did not seek independence, but dominion status under the crown. They could not officially oppose the investiture without appearing to be in contradiction to their own policy.<sup>419</sup> At their 1968 conference a vote was taken on opposing the Investiture, and was defeated.<sup>420</sup> In effect, Plaid Cymru tried their utmost to ignore the Investiture, and their leaders took no part in the ceremony.

However, many of their rank and file were unhappy with this position. In effect, opposition to the Investiture came from *Cymdeithas yr Iaith* [Welsh Language Society], and there were numerous protests against the Investiture. *Cymdeithas yr Iaith*'s oppositional role was controversial. 'Mabon', writing in *Barn*, criticised the move from the narrow issue of the Welsh language as turning the movement into 'professional protesters', and there were attacks on the move into the 'political realm'.<sup>421</sup> One of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith*'s prominent members, Emyr Llywelyn, stated that *Cymdeithas* had little choice but to show opposition, as Plaid Cymru would not do so. He added:

Dim ond person sydd wedi anghofio i ba genedl mae e'n perthyn iddi allai dderbyn Siarl fel Tywysog Cymru heb godi llais mewn protest<sup>422</sup>

[Only a person who has forgotten which nation he belongs to can accept Charles as Prince of Wales without raising a voice in protest.]

Significantly, Llywelyn also cited J R Jones (to whom we shall come to presently) on the schizophrenia of the Welsh identification with Britishness, and that those celebrating the investiture had 'lost their instinctive response and were now responding to something fake' ('collodd rhai eu hymateb greddfoll a bellach maent yn ymateb i rywbeth ffug'), indicating the wider discourses of national identity which opponents of the Investiture could draw on that were not available in 1911.<sup>423</sup>

What I am interested in here are the underlying discourses of the opposition, and commentary and narration of the ritual. Nevertheless, it is important to note that this was a turning point for *Cymdeithas yr Iaith*, who had never previously moved outside

---

<sup>419</sup> A D Rees, 'Golygyddol', *Barn* (Dec 1967)

<sup>420</sup> D Gwynn, 'Yr Arwisgiad', p 171

<sup>421</sup> Mabon, 'Dyfodol Cymdeithas yr Iaith', in *Barn* (January: 1968)

<sup>422</sup> E Llywelyn, letter to the editor, *Barn* (March: 1968)

<sup>423</sup> *ibid*

the narrow parameters of the Welsh language as a single issue. As Dylan Phillips states:

Trwy grwydro oddi ar lwybr cul yr ymgyrch iaith, llwyddodd protestiadau'r Arwisgiad i orfodi arweinwyr y Gymdeithas i ystyried yn ddwys ei safle o fewn y cyd-destun gwleidyddol ehangach yng Nghymru ac i ddatblygu ei strategaeth ymgyrchu a'i pholisiau.

O ganlyniad, datblygodd y Gymdeithas nifer o ymgyrchoedd mwy gwleidyddol a chymdeithasol eu nature na'r ymgyrchoedd statws cyfyng y canolbwyntiwyd arnynt cyn hynny.<sup>424</sup>

[By wandering of the narrow path of the language campaign, the Investiture protests forced the leaders of the Society to ponder deeply their position in the wider political context in Wales and to develop their campaigning strategy and their policies.

As a result, the Society developed a series of campaigns more political and social in nature than the narrow status campaigns they concentrated on until that point.]

This led to a new significance given to protecting communities, and the 'fight for the language' and the 'fight for the land' were inextricably linked. Ultimately, it led to Cymdeithas yr Iaith's espousal of socialism. As will be seen, the influence of J R Jones's philosophy is key to this understanding, but also wider discourses of 'Welshness' which Pyrs Gruffud has called the Welsh 'geographical imagination'.<sup>425</sup>

This Welsh geographical imagination of land and landscape can be seen in (for example) poetry and literature, geography, and also political philosophy. It is useful to summarise Gruffudd's analysis of this 'poetic territory of the nation', before looking at the philosophy of J R Jones as an exemplar of this and therefore of Cymdeithas yr Iaith's, viewpoint. Gruffudd states:

Y mae syniadau ynghylch 'cynefin' a 'diwylliant gwerin' yn ymgorffori'r cenedlaetholdeb rhamantaidd sy'n cyferbynnu llygredd trefol a phurdeb gwledig, ac y mae'r cysyniad o 'famwlad' yn pwysleisio arwyddocad symbolaidd tiriogaeth yn hytrach na'i swyddogaeth...Y mae'r cydadwaith rhwng tir ac iaith yn agwedd hanfodol ar y mytholegu a'r cenedlaetholi hwn.<sup>426</sup>

---

<sup>424</sup> D Phillips, 'Hanes Cymdeithas yr Iaith', p 457

<sup>425</sup> P Gruffudd, 'Yr Iaith Gymraeg a'r Dychymyg Daearyddol 1918-1950' in G H Jenkins and M A Williams, *'Eu Hiaith a Gadwant?': Y Gymraeg yn yr Ugeinfed Ganrif* Gwasg Prifysgol Cyntu: 2000)

<sup>426</sup> *ibid*, p 108

[Ideas concerning ‘locality’ and ‘folk culture’ make material the romantic nationalism that contrasts urban corruption and rural purity, and the concept of the ‘motherland’ emphasises the symbolic significance of territory rather than its instrumentality...This interpenetration between land and language is an essential part of such mythologizing and nation-making.]

Morgan traces this thought back in its particularly politicised form to Iorwerth C Peate in the late twenties, who used the popular geographic idea of the borderline to indicate an encroachment of Anglicised modernity on Welsh rural traditional heartlands.<sup>427</sup> Technological advancement, transport and tourism were linked to this modernity in which ‘the organic movement of the border...was overtaken by modernity’.<sup>428</sup> It is in this respect, that the building of a ‘Bombing school’ in Penyberth in 1936, and the expropriation of military lands in Epynt in 1940, as well as the drowning of the village of Capel Celyn in Tryweryn Valley in 1959 to provide a water reservoir for Liverpool were seen in terms of a colonisation of Welsh land, but also, and inextricably linked, an attack on the Welsh language.<sup>429</sup> In this way, space is transformed into place, that is, spaces inscribed with meaning.<sup>430</sup> It is important to note that this discourse was not – and more importantly, could not - be articulated in the context of the 1911 investiture where local (Welsh) space was seen as interlinked with and incorporated within near-universal (Imperial) space.

However, it was central in 1969 for the nationalist movement, and such ideas of colonisation of places were utilised in the context of the Investiture. One can see this in T Emyr Pritchard where he notes the ‘experience of shock’ (‘profiad ysgytwol’) of finding a ‘new characteristic’ to a space one has known for a long time – here Caernarfon Castle.<sup>431</sup> The castle appeared to be without history until he saw the Royal Welch Fusiliers exhibit in the museum where it ‘became’ the property of the British Empire and not the Welsh to him:

Os oes arnoch eisiau blasu militariaeth ymerodrol Saesnig fel yr oedd yn ei rym, ewch i amgueddfa yng Nghastell Caernarfon. Cewch wedd newydd ar y castell ac ar hanes eich cenedl eich hun yn y fargen. Arhosodd amser yn ei

---

<sup>427</sup> *ibid*, p 116-18

<sup>428</sup> *ibid*

<sup>429</sup> *ibid*, p 120-5

<sup>430</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited* (University of Wales Press: 2004), p 80

<sup>431</sup> T Emyr Pritchard, *Barn* (March: 1969), p 120

unfan yn yr amgueddfa hon; ynnddi, mae'r haul ymerodrol yn parhau i dywynnu'n ffyrnig ar eich gwegil.<sup>432</sup>

[If you wish to taste the English imperial militarism as it was at the height of its power, go to the museum at Caernarfon Castle. You will see the castle in a new light and the history of your own nation in the bargain. Time stood still in this museum; in it, the imperial sun still shines furiously upon your nape.]

Importantly, he notes that there is little to do with Wales in the exhibit. As in the name of the fusiliers, the exhibit is 'Welch not Welsh', that is an illustration of the loss of Welsh identity dating from the 1282 conquest and the Acts of Union.<sup>433</sup> This 'proper' Welshness, of course, is separate from that of the Bosworthian British-Welsh espoused in 1911 (and by proponents of the investiture in 1969), now seen as Welch, a parody and insult of 'real' Welsh identity. This decoupling is important in order to understand the discourses opposition to the investiture drew upon.

J R Jones, widely seen as the key philosophical influence on *Cymdeithas yr Iaith* is an exemplar of this poetic territoriality. Kirsti Bohata has noted Jones's resonances with postcolonialism.<sup>434</sup> There certainly are resonances, in particular his evocation of the 'homelessness of the human spirit', and his theological debate with D R Thomas on national identity and religion underlines similar ideas in advocating the particular microcosm as history and memory, rather than the universal history of borderless community of man (*sic*).<sup>435</sup> Nevertheless, this homelessness is seen in negative terms, in the alienation from what he sees as the two bonds ('deuclwm') of what constitutes the people – its land and its language, or languages.<sup>436</sup> The Welsh, he states, are 'a people' and not 'a nation', because the latter are linked by three bonds – the two noted, and the third, state sovereignty.<sup>437</sup>

In this concept of *cydymdreiddiad* (interpenetration) between land and language is important. To a people there are two formative bonds. Firstly, there is the 'internal' bond of spiritual unity exemplified in language as a medium of communicating

---

<sup>432</sup> *ibid*

<sup>433</sup> *ibid*

<sup>434</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited*, p 97-8

<sup>435</sup> J R Jones, *Gwaedd yng Nghyrmu* (Wasg y Dderwen: 1970), 7-16

<sup>436</sup> J R Jones, *Prydeindod* (Llyfrau Dryw: 1966), p 9

<sup>437</sup> *ibid*



tradition. Secondly, there is the ‘external’ unity of space which has been shared over generations. Ned Thomas thus describes *cydymdreiddiad* as:

that subtle...interpenetration, which he says, grows in time (in people’s consciousness) between a territory and its people and their language creating a sense of belonging to a particular stretch of the earth’s surface. From the point of view of an established and secure culture such as England this may seem a rather vague and mystical notion. The secure culture takes it largely for granted and therefore leaves it undefined. But in various parts of the world, the absence or loss of *cydymdreiddiad* focuses the mind powerfully upon the idea.<sup>438</sup>

It is in this interpenetration that national memory and community-feeling is defended in linking land and language.

For JR Jones, Wales is not part of a British ‘nation’, because for him the language and land are signifiers of difference. However ‘Britishness’ is an ideology that breeds false consciousness of belonging and self-loathing toward the language and a form of schizophrenia. This is linked also to a loss of national memory – although Jones does not use it, it is significant that the word ‘gwallgof’ (madness) is linked to ‘cof’ (memory), and literary means ‘loss of’ or ‘mistaken memory’, and this links to his psychological view of nationhood. Britishness is thus not a geographical unit, and certainly not a ‘nation’, but rather is an ideology which can be seen as constructing Welshmen as (falsely) English, exemplified in the power relation he sees as ‘the England that includes Wales’<sup>439</sup>

This posits a problem, in that it acts as placing non-Welsh speakers in a problematic relation to his philosophy. Jones indicates that this is not a total loss of identity, but rather it is by degrees. Nevertheless, it is the linguistic Welsh heartlands which must be the prime exemplars of real Welsh identity:

Y mae fel petai ‘drwch’ neu ‘ddwysedd’ i’r hunaniaeth...Cyn belled a bod iddi *drwyddi*’r gwahanrwydd a gasglwyd i rychwant yr enw ‘Wales’, gellid dweud y gwasgarwyd yr hunaniaeth Gymreig yn haen denau dros ei holl dir – yn llai tenau yma ac yn fwy tenau acw. Yn yr ystyr hon, y mae gwladychwyr daear ‘Wales’ i gyd yn Gymru ac yn un Bobl. Eithr ni eill fod carn a llygad-ffynnon yr hunaniaeth denau, daenedig hon yn unman ar y ddaear ond yn y Gymru

---

<sup>438</sup> N Thomas, *Derek Walcott: Poet of the Islands* (University of Wales Press: 1980), p 15

<sup>439</sup> J R Jones, *Gwaedd yng Nghymru*, p 18

Gymraeg, sef y gwahanrwydd cyfan deuglwm lle mae'n dal i fod mewn cyswllt byw a'r gorffennol oesol a roes fodolaeth iddo.<sup>440</sup>

[It is as if there is a 'thickness' or a 'depth' to the identity...As long as there is to it *throughout* the difference that has been built in the span of territory named 'Wales', one can say that Welsh identity has been thinly spread across its whole land – less thinly here and thinner there. In this sense, inhabitants of the land of 'Wales' are all Welsh and one people. But the core and centre-point of this identity cannot be anywhere on that land but in Welsh-speaking Wales, that is in the complete double-bonded difference that remains the connection of everyday life and the ancient past that gave it its existence.]

The political significance given to loss of identity, linked to 'false consciousness', is consciousness-raising. Nevertheless, the exclusions of this discourse manifest themselves in a particular gendered view of national and anti-modernity, in that the female and the urban are signifiers of danger, as seen (rather comically) in his description of the Welshwoman moving to the West Wales town of Carmarthen:

Yn y dref, caeodd 'byd' amdani lle'r aeth y llun ohoni ei hun fel Cymraes yn gymysglyd yn ei meddwl; canys, heb yn wybod iddi, yr oedd yn gweithio arni'n ddiderugaredd dynfa hunaniaeth arall. Gweithia'r dynfa ar ei hisymwybod yn ffurf 'awgrym' ymwithiol, perswadiol mai'r Saesneg rywfodd *oedd i fod*, oedd yn 'bwysig', oedd yn 'iawn'. Ac mewn awyrgylch a lwythai'r perswad a'r ymdeimlad hwn arni, ni fedrai hi ddim *bod* fel Cymraes.<sup>441</sup>

In the town, a 'world' closed around her where the view of herself as a Welshwoman became confused in her mind; because, without her knowledge, it was working on her mercilessly the attraction of another identity. This attraction works upon her unconsciousness in the form of an assertive, persuasive 'suggestion' that English was somehow *meant to be*, was 'important', was 'right'. And in an environment which pushed this persuasion and feeling upon her, she could not *be* a Welshwoman.

This formulation of Welshness as rural, traditional and with the 'language of the hearth' is in fact the oppositional discourse to that of supporters of the Investiture, seen in the faux-Edwardian tone of the *Western Mail*:

The investiture can serve as no other event in recent years to bring progress to Wales. It offers all Welshmen an opportunity of uniting in the service of their country. If this is taken, the dynamism which is needed to build a better Wales economically, socially and spiritually could be provided. And in the outside world a proud image of the Principality and its people could be created.<sup>442</sup>

---

<sup>440</sup> *ibid*, 16-17

<sup>441</sup> J R Jones, *Prydeindod*, p 42

<sup>442</sup> cited D Gwynn, 'Yr Arwisgiad', p 178

Both sides implicitly share a view of what is modern and progressive (English, urban), but only construct that ‘modernity’ as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. A line from self-consciously nationalist poet Gerallt Lloyd Owen illustrates this point ‘gwerth cynnyd yw gwarth cenedl’ (‘Progress’s virtue is the nation’s shame’).<sup>443</sup> This discourse of the ‘real Wales’ as rural and traditional against and separate from anglicised modernity (as seen in the South) is what allowed Caernarfon to stage the event in the first place, and is ironically what would now drive the opposition to it.

Jones viewed the investiture as an ideological tool to reassert the hold of the British ideology upon the Welsh. The paternalism of the view of the ‘gwerin’ can be seen in his view that the ‘mute’ ordinary folk are ‘blind’ and ‘cannot understand’ (‘di-ddeall’) as the ‘poor defenceless’ (‘trueni diamddiffyn’).<sup>444</sup> In this view what he terms the treachery of those intelligentsia who attended the investiture was to ‘refuse their patronage of leadership to the ordinary Welshman’.<sup>445</sup> The implication being, of course that the leadership is left to the anti-investiture *intelligentsia* over the poor blind simple ‘gwerin’ (‘folk’). This is clearly linked to the idea of false consciousness as placing an enlightened elite who need to raise consciousness.

The ‘gwerin’ forms an important role in the Welsh national imagination. Here we see its monstrous other – what the ‘gwerin’ have degenerated into. Jones uses a quotation by Vaughan Hughes, who regarded the investiture as unimportant, who was shocked to see the ‘brainwashing’ at work on the big day, as the people lost their idea of history and were influenced to accept ‘lies and nonsense and treachery’.<sup>446</sup> Hughes ends with the shocked words ‘This is Wales. This is the Welsh *gwerin*’ (‘Dyma Gymru. Dyma’r werin Gymraeg’).<sup>447</sup> This shock can only arise from the elevation of the *gwerin* in discourses on Welshness, and indicates the move to ideas of ‘false consciousness’ from their real identity. The crowds at Caernarfon are taken to reflect and represent the Welsh people in general, an unjustifiable move from my theoretical standpoint on ritual. In this we can see a situation akin to that of the Durkheimian and Marxist approaches to ritual in the first section of this chapter, which while opposed,

---

<sup>443</sup> G Lloyd Owen, ‘Etifeddiaeth’ in *Cerddi’r Cywilydd* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1972)

<sup>444</sup> J R Jones, *Gwaedd yng Nghymru*, p 59-61

<sup>445</sup> *ibid*

<sup>446</sup> *ibid*,

<sup>447</sup> *ibid*

share the same presuppositions of ritual as reflecting society, but with the ritual denigrated as ‘bad’, rather than elevated as ‘morally good’.

It is this discursive background, then, that indicates the context for the oppositional commentary of the time. The construction of the national subject, is, as Bhabha notes not only historical but also performative (after all, if the ‘gwerin’ were acting the same in 1911 – and there certainly was enthusiasm – then one would expect the same in 1969).<sup>448</sup> In this context, then, commentaries and *writing* on the investiture, and writings on false consciousness and the degeneration of the gwerin ‘perform’ a particular operation of consciousness-raising. The narration of the event can be exemplified also in national consciousness raising poetry, the most prominent exponent of which is Gerallt Lloyd Owen, and his famous poem ‘Fy Ngwlad’ (‘My Country’), who in popular verse, outlines many of the tensions of Jones’s philosophy.

The poem begins by a call to Llywelyn, the last Welsh Prince, with the words:

Weep, Weep, Llywelyn,  
Thou would weep blood were you to see this.

Wylit, wylit, Lywelyn,  
Wylit waed pe gwelit hyn .<sup>449</sup>

The ‘this’ is the Investiture, with ‘our Crown’ held by a conqueror and ‘our hearts’ by a ‘foreign man’ (estron wr). As in Jones, the gwerin has diminished by becoming ‘Britified’ (‘Prydeinwyd’), and is now a ‘gwerin of favour-lovers (ffafrgarwyr)’ in accepting the investiture with open arms. But a ‘gwerin’ is not a ‘gwerin’ when it is enslaved (‘caeth’) by becoming so ‘loyal’ without ‘roots or bonds of locality (‘bro’), again exemplifying the link to land of Welsh nationality. Owen then turns on the intelligentsia, who will not be fooled by the lies of the stories of old times (‘hanesion rhyw hen oesau’) as they are ‘moderate in passion’ and the ‘men who were Britified’. They are ‘lukewarm patriots’ but ‘internationalist extremists’.

The poem ends with a call to arms and a call for blood:

---

<sup>448</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 148

<sup>449</sup> G Lloyd Owen, ‘Fy Ngwlad’ in *Cerddi'r Cywilydd* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1972)

My country, my country, you may have my sword,  
Bloodied for your honour,  
O yes, yes we shall,  
Lose this blood for your sake.

Fy ngwlad, fy ngwlad, cei fy ngledde,  
Yn wridog dros d'anrhydedd.  
O gallwn, gallwn golli  
Y gwaed hwn o'th blegid di.

This appeal to glory, while clearly linked also to the battle poetry of the early Welsh poetry of Aneurin and Taliesin, also has resonance with the Investiture it attacks in its counter-positioning of a mythical and romanticised sovereign. It also clearly alludes to the Welsh national anthem 'Hen Wlad fy Nhadau' ('Land of Our Fathers') which claims that the Welsh 'lost our blood in the name of freedom' ('Dros ryddid collasant eu gwaed'). Lloyd Owen performed his poetry at a protest ceremony of remembrance to Llewelyn the Last in Cilmeri, where he is said to have fallen. As R R Davies described the ceremony, in an article titled as a pointed reference to R T Jenkins' critique of Plaid Cymru ideologues Saunders Lewis and Ambrose Bebb's use of history as romanticising the past:

Ond y mae'r gwrth-arwisgwyr, hefyd yn eu tro yn euog o ystumio hanes...Aethant yn Llywelyn-addolwyr, gan romanteiddio y Llyw Olaf a'i droi yn rhyw fath o fab darogan i arbed Cymru rhag Siarl...mae wylofain uwchben carreg-goffa Llywelyn bron mor ddi-ystyr a'r rhialtwch dibwrpas a gynhyrchwyd yng Nhaernarfon.<sup>450</sup>

But the anti-investiturists also in their turn are guilty of perverting history...They became Llywelyn-worshippers, and romanticised the Last turning him into a sort of prodigal son to save Wales from Charles...wailing above Llywelyn's memorial stone is almost as nonsensical as the purposeless pomp produced in Caernarfon.

R R Davies captures the similarities between the two ceremonies and discourses of nationhood, although the subtle 'almost as' acknowledges that one story is more historically accurate than the other. The Welsh counter-ritual creates an alternative sentimental and romantic view of national feeling to that of the faux-Edwardian show of antiquity and traditionalised medievalism as a mirror image to that of the Investiture show itself.

---

<sup>450</sup> R R Davies, *Yr Apel at Hanes*: Vintage '69, in Barn Sep 1969; RT Jenkins, *Yr Apel at Hanes* (Wrexham Press: 1930)

The reason to look at this particular poem on the investiture is precisely because it is a powerful denunciation, utilising many of the tropes seen in J R Jones's work and the wider discourse of the Welsh geographical imagination, but also because it has become a part of the Welsh literary canon, and thus it is a narrative of the event that inscribes meaning upon it which is repeated through its inclusion in various curricula and syllabuses. It is a part of the present curriculum of Welsh first language and literature at the GCSE and A Level, as well as the university level. Recently, in a Welsh version of *The Nation's Favourite Poems* ('Hoff Gerddi Cymru'), it was voted the nation's favourite poem as voted for at Gomer publishers' stall in the Eisteddfod. The preface indicates how important school syllabuses are in allowing access to the poems, indicating that a large part of the list were drawn from syllabuses.<sup>451</sup>

In this sense, it is possible to view this as encouraging a particular reading of the event *retrospectively*, and through it a construction of Welshness and national memory that has gained a certain hegemonic power in being the story of the Investiture for a significant minority in Wales. One must be careful about noting the significance of this inclusion in the canon, of course – Lloyd Owen's work was controversial within Welsh speaking Wales at the time. T H Parry Williams' depoliticised and ambivalent poem of romantic nationalism, 'Hon' ('This Spot'), is also included with its glorifying of landscape away from 'the excited words of the extremists all' ('o gyffro geiriau'r eithafwyr oll'). Parry Williams was in the audience of the Investiture. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that it Lloyd Owen's work that is the story of that particular event.

This is not, of course, necessarily to question this poem's merit. This viewpoint does entail, however, denaturalising its position and acknowledging that in different circumstances praise poetry to Charles may have been the canonical text. After all, there is a tradition of praise in medieval poetry of the nobles' bards ('Beirdd yr Uchelwyr'). That this poem was voted for at the Eisteddfod may indicate a cultural status for a particular constituency, but it was at the Eisteddfod where Charles was invited to speak in 1969, that protesters opposing his visit were appalled to realise

---

<sup>451</sup> *Hoff Gerddi Cymru* (Gomer: 2005), preface

they were in such a small minority in that constituency. This indicates that a particular myth of royalty and investiture had displaced another as hegemonic, at least among a large part of welsh speakers in Wales.

Also, there are a majority of pupils who do not take the Welsh subject in the first language. However, Robert Phillips has indicated the rapid growth of the idea of Welshness in the national history curriculum. Whereas in history teaching as a ‘fundamental feature of national identity [as] a perception of a shared past (‘the historical we’) it could be argued that prior to 1989, Wales did not exist at all!’ because of the lack of Welsh history.<sup>452</sup> Phillips notes, however, that the movement to a *Curriculum Cymreig* from 1993, which emphasised a commitment to ‘place and heritage’ and a ‘sense of belonging’ and of ‘important Welsh figures’ totally overwhelmed a different initiative *Community Understanding*, aimed at indicating how different communities had developed and operate today.<sup>453</sup> It is fair, therefore to say that the education system provides a certain viewpoint of the ‘geographical imagination’, and that the Welsh syllabus is a part of this (for example, it has syllabuses based on ‘locale’ [‘bro’] and ‘nation’).<sup>454</sup> In positing a particular account and meaning of the investiture, it is clear that this oppositional position has subverted the hegemonic relation, and carries a performative power through writing, linked to certain institutional nodes, of its own.

## Conclusion

It is possible to view the empty signifier of the ‘Prince of Wales’, and the meaninglessness of royal ritual as encouraging a hegemonic – in Laclau’s sense of conferring meaning on empty signifiers – struggle for meaning and understanding of the event of the investiture, and this indicates that such narration does not end with the event itself, but continues in contestation over its narration and inscription into the future. Such an analytical viewpoint is important in illustrating how the 1969

---

<sup>452</sup> R Phillips, *Island Stories and Border Crossings: School History and the Discursive Creation of National Identity* in J Aaron and C Williams *Postcolonial Wales* (Cardiff: 2005), p 47

<sup>453</sup> *ibid*, p 49

<sup>454</sup> *ibid*, p 48

Investiture can be re-inscribed as a different symbolic meaning to that which has clearly been seen in 1911, and even to how it was read in 1969 (including how it was intended to be read), and indicates that it is this meaning that has acquired hegemonic power. This is indicative of the performative power and cultural status that the Welsh intelligentsia had through writing, but also how they have carried influence in particular cultural areas, such as schools, in indicating a certain view of what it is to be Welsh.

Such projects are ambivalent. Bohata states, for all its problems and dangers of nostalgia and sentimentality, such a call to memory is vitally important as such writing can be seen as:

writing *against* the loss of a culture, against the loss of memory of a place; so in (re)populating the places that have been portrayed as empty and actually emptied by the policies of central government, these writers seek to remember past and place and so to change the present and future of Wales...what is important is a politicisation of memory.<sup>455</sup>

Nevertheless, it is also important to note (as Bohata does) that identarian closure also construct exclusions, and with memory comes forgetting. It is useful to recall Benedict Anderson's analysis of the following quotation by Ernest Renan:

Yet the essence of the nation is that all the individuals have many things in common, and that they have forgotten many things...every French citizen has to have forgotten the massacre of Saint Bartholomew.<sup>456</sup>

As Anderson notes, Renan does not feel the need to explain what the 'massacre of Saint Bartholomew' was, nor what it means. The phrase 'has to have forgotten' (*doit avoir oublié*) rather than 'have to forget' (*doit oublier*) in effect tells his readers to 'have already forgotten' what he 'assumed that they naturally remembered'!<sup>457</sup> Memory, in this sense, also assumes forgetting – as Jenny Edkins puts it, 'a necessary condition for memory is "forgetfulness" – if memory were complete, it would not be memory but something else'.<sup>458</sup> It is in this sense that we are looking at something other than historicity, and the referential link between word and event.

---

<sup>455</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited*, p 102-3

<sup>456</sup> E Renan, 'What is the Nation?' in H K Bhabha (ed) *Nation and Narration* (Blackwell: 1990), p 11

<sup>457</sup> B Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (Verso: 1991), p 200

<sup>458</sup> J Edkins, *Poststructuralism and International Relations* (Lynne Reiner: 1999), p 72



Nevertheless, this memory is also clearly selective, and requires ‘forgetting’. This is necessarily ‘narration’ and not what is often viewed as ‘history’. What we see in the stories of investitures is precisely the need to select events as valid or not to build up the story or biography of the nation. In 1911, overwhelmingly, it was to view the Welsh as part of Britain and partners in its Empire, but also to celebrate its Celticist distinctiveness as deserving and reflecting (at the same time) its part in the Empire. Intertextuality allows us to look beyond authorial scripting of the event, to see its structural position of hegemony. In this sense, there was a requirement to both ‘remember’ English oppression, but also to ‘forget’ it.

In 1969, the shifts in discourse allowed the place of Caernarfon Castle to be imbued with a politicised meaning (its meaning as a symbol of oppression was there in 1911, but had little political resonance outside an illustration of reconciliation of Welsh and English), which could be linked to a certain view of colonising of Welsh space and psychology, linking language and land. In this view there was required a decoupling of Wales from Britain, which required a forgetting of the position of Wales within Empire as ‘another Wales’ to the ‘real’ one. In this sense, it was important to ‘forget’ 1911 as this ‘unreal’ Wales, improper, or ideologically oppressed under ‘false consciousness’ of Britishness.

This viewpoint was not and could not have been articulated in 1911, but it is the mythic story of the nation that is salient for today in relation to the Investiture. This is not to say that everyone in Wales would agree about this event, nor that there are not multiple articulations of ‘Welshness’, but simply that one who is aware of the ‘structured set’ series of events linked to Welsh nationalism (Penyberth, Epynt, Investiture) is more likely to have been exposed to – and agreed with – Gerallt Lloyd Owen’s version of events than that of George Thomas. Cultural and performative power in writing has allowed a certain hegemonic power to Welsh writing of this particular event. The danger is that this more ‘official’ version of events may carry nostalgia and stasis rather than politicisation of memory, loaded as it often is with gendered constructs, particular views of land and landscape linking the ‘proper’ people to rurality, and at times a conservative view of heroic glory.

Certainly, in this context, this writing indicated ‘politicisation’, but as the repetition of the Investiture is repeated in a different context and is assigned different meanings, so the re-reading of texts may prove rather different over thirty years on. The need to decouple from Empire and Britishness was a strategic and discursive rupture for the nationalism of the sixties, but one becomes concerned that in the wider sense it may abrogate historical responsibility in forgetting. This quotation by Ned Thomas gives an indication of what is meant in separation of ideal identities of ‘Welsh’ and ‘British’:

I am not exonerating Welshmen from having participated in British imperialism. It is merely that when they did so they did so as Britishers, not as Welshmen. The Welsh language was not part of that imperialism, and as Welsh speakers in their own country the Welsh were themselves the victim of a kind of imperialism.<sup>459</sup>

Thomas, like J R Jones et al, implicitly links language and land as microcosm, implying that that the Welsh - or at least the Welsh language which if abandoned signified subjects as ‘Britishers’ – did not *really* expand beyond their own territory unless ideologically duped to do so. What we have seen in our analysis of 1911 is that in *that* narrative to be Welsh was to be proud to be British, according to the Welsh themselves. The 1969 narrative of the heroic ‘gwerin’ now emasculated depends on forgetting such problems and of positing an ideal timeless gwerin in the past to renew the present. It is thus doubled but also ambivalent – where is this ‘gwerin’ except as that monstrous double seen in the crowds of the investiture? It is a mythic construction of a national subject around which to politicise language and land, but may also allow for a ‘forgetting’ of the Welsh role in Empire as something which masked the ‘real Wales’. This would be a significant abrogation of historical responsibility, and the current work in postcolonialism in Wales is meant precisely to question Wales’ role.

Nevertheless, such a subversion required a vocabulary, a different code by which to construct an aberrant reading of the ritual, and in this sense what was written in 1969 could not have been in 1911. In those sixty-odd years, discursive shifts happened in the fields of Welsh academic texts, and constructed a national ‘geographical imagination’ on which opponents of the investiture could draw. The necessary

---

<sup>459</sup> N Thomas, *The Welsh Extremist* (Y Lolfa: 1991), p 31

condition for that change in discourse was the retreat of the extra-territorial Empire. One could say that in Wales official and institutionalised ideas of previously marginalised Welsh history could only emerge in the 1990s. Nevertheless, it is vital to remember the multiple possibilities and articulations of Welshness, and remember that lack of contestation may lead to cultural entropy and to hardened identity-politics. What was vital and necessary to a marginal group in the 1960s may be as necessary as to a foreign country in Wales today.

### Chapter 3: Language, Nationality and Authenticity: Translation and Hybridity in Welsh Culture

Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth – that is, the types of discourse it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances that enable one to distinguish true and false statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what is true.

- Michel Foucault, ‘Truth and Power’<sup>460</sup>

The representation of difference must not be hastily read as the reflection of *pre-given* ethnic or cultural traits set to the fixed tablet of tradition. The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorise cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation. The ‘right’ to signify from the periphery of authorised power and privilege does not depend on the persistence of tradition; it is resourced by the power of tradition to be reinscribed through the conditions of contingency and contradictoriness that attend upon the lives of those who are ‘in the minority’. In restaging the past it introduces other, incommensurable cultural temporalities into the invention of tradition. This process estranges any immediate access to an originary identity or a ‘received’ tradition.

- Homi K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*<sup>461</sup>

The previous chapters have looked at the role of resistance and complicity, negotiation and subversion in the context of what maybe taken to be predominantly the Welsh-speaking Welsh in relation to Britishness. This chapter analyses some of the claims to authenticity and particular national narrative that was constructed in opposition to a ‘British Wales’, and aimed to decouple Welsh identity from Empire, in the literary criticism of Saunders Lewis, and some of its effects. The chapter also analyses, prior and parallel to Lewis’s work, the construction of English Literature as linking Literature’s moral value and classical tradition in a national narrative similar in many ways to that of Saunders Lewis, but with very different effects. These different effects are because of Lewis’s relatively marginal position in articulating these concepts to a resistant politicisation of culture. The aim is to illustrate how

---

<sup>460</sup> M Foucault, ‘Truth and Power’ in J D Faubion *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994), p 131

<sup>461</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994), p 2

similar conceptions of moral value and language, linked to a national narrative have different effects in their construction and effects in different contexts.

The geographical imagination of Wales was open to subversion as the discursive formation of Imperial Wales was destabilised. Much as this led to an opening up of the Investiture ritual to contestation, as analysed in chapter 2, this articulation of British Wales could be subverted by a different national narrative emphasising the moral value of an alternative constructed tradition. In this vein, Saunders Lewis' national narrative was of a different relation between particular and universal space. It was representative of a movement that was targeted to destroy the self-satisfied imperial and Celticist sentiment of Liberal Edwardian Wales.

This chapter analyses the way this construction of Welshness was articulated within Wales and some of its effects, and the bases on which this authority of Welsh authenticity was constructed in order to speak about and for Wales from a particular political standpoint. The chapter will outline a genealogy of Saunders Lewis's rereading of Welsh literature as channelling moral and spiritual value, and how this adopted and translated the high cultural standpoint similar to that developed in the discipline of English Literature in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. However, this had different political effects when translated into the context of Wales and made culture – as the spiritual and moral essence of the nation – politicised and contested. By contrast, in England, this discourse of Literature and civilisation was given institutional authority as national orthodoxy.

Lewis's work was a particularly singular vision articulated against the work of Sir John Morris Jones and Sir John Rhys, pillars of the Welsh establishment (as the knighthoods indicate) developed from the philology of the Celtic studies inaugurated by Matthew Arnold, whereby scientific analysis of the literature of the past was mummified and allowed little room to play outside those of philological rationality. Lewis was part of a wider move away from this scientific basis, but also constructed a particular national narrative. As Pennar Davies puts it:

With all due respect to his predecessors and contemporaries...it was Lewis who first adequately interpreted the tradition and made it possible for us to begin to appreciate it. Others had endeavoured to continue the art and after its decay to

restore it with patriotic fervour or antiquarian zeal. John Morris-Jones negatively established its canons and carefully set forth its techniques; W J Gruffydd attempted to distinguish between the poetic personalities of some of its masters. It was left to Saunders Lewis to expound its ethos and to initiate us into the secret of its peculiar glory.<sup>462</sup>

This 'secret' was an artistic tradition 'expressing the ideal of a Christian society' and an expression of 'patterns of conduct' aimed at the 'social harmony of mankind.'<sup>463</sup> This construction of a breathtaking universality within a localised tradition was his alternative view of the local in the global to that of the British.

The chapter begins by examining how the field of English Literature, which is often seen as natural and common-sensical, was constructed piecemeal from alien forms. It articulated its position in relation to both the Greek and Roman Classics and 'Teutonic' Philology, and in doing so provided a particular aesthetic literary history that constructed an English canon in relation to ideas of European civilisation, English nationality and exceptionalism. It is thus no coincidence that one still refers to the great books in the English canon as 'classics' – popularised in such series as 'Penguin Classics'. English also, of course, derived its power from its purportedly moral(ising) and civil(ising) effects – a position that required its own missionaries as educators to the nation and as its defenders against the pernicious effects of modernity. The effect of this, given their prominent positions in the universities and the educational establishment was to make English Literature the discipline for moral value as a keystone of English education.

The second part of the chapter examines the construction of a particular Welsh literary criticism, that of Lewis, and points to similarities between its assumptions and that of English Literature. Lewis, like many Welsh scholars, adopted the mores and values of English Literature, but was also to rearticulate this discourse into a national narrative and assumption of the literary critic's authority to speak for Wales from his own particular position. This was done by positioning of nationality and language within an European classicist tradition, but also in the elite position of the critic who's authority was asserted by his reception and channelling of that tradition. In making

---

<sup>462</sup> P Davies, 'His Criticism', in AR Jones and G Thomas *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press: 1973)

<sup>463</sup> *ibid*

this particular manifestation of a national narrative Lewis also constructed a particular identification of ‘Welshness’ and civility to which it was implied all proper artists and readers should aspire.

This discourse was asserted from the margins in opposition to romantic orthodoxies of the individual artist as producer of great works as well as Philology. Its mythic historical national narrative had effect in the social and cultural sphere. As Lewis noted of Welsh in education in evidence to the report *Welsh in Education and Life*, ‘the study of the Literature of Wales, and a humane rather than a scientific study of language, should be their main concern.’<sup>464</sup> Given Lewis’s relatively marginal position in Welsh education, this viewpoint had a different effect when translated into the context of Wales, than had the similar construction of English Literature. In its particular instance of a challenge to the liberal consensus of Edwardian Wales it asserted a different articulation of the national and international (or more accurately intra-national), forming a challenge to a view of Wales within an universal and global Empire of ‘unity in diversity’ by placing Wales within an older and spiritual pan-European civilisation. It was thus a contestation of imperial universalism, with Wales at its centre in an ‘Anglo-Celtic Empire’, with a view of its historical place in a European Latin and Catholic civilisation.<sup>465</sup>

It was this articulation of identity that Anglo-Welsh literary critics also accommodated in developing the basis for their discipline and their own position of speaking for Wales and its literature. In attempting to illustrate standards of Welshness in English medium writing in Wales they were attempting to construct a tradition and lineage of Anglo-Welsh writing stretching back to the pre-industrial community. In accepting the terms of the debate around Welsh tradition, and demarcating their discipline around it, they placed themselves within that discourse which asserted that there were relative standards for what was and was not

---

<sup>464</sup> T R Chapman, *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer: Cofiant Saunders Lewis* (Gomer: 2006), p 105

<sup>465</sup> His relative enthusiasm for the Monarchy and aim of Dominion Status for Wales could fit with this view of pan-national monarchical lineages. After all, for Lewis the English King Edward I’s conquest of 1282 had little impact on Welsh Culture, which could maintain its autonomy under a foreign monarch. It was the ‘materialist’ intervention of the Tudors, Protestantism and government in 1536 which he saw as causing decline in Wales. [S Lewis, *Principles of Nationalism* (Plaid Cymru: 1975), p 5-7; on Dominion Status see Richard Wyn Jones, *Rhoi Cymru’n Gyntaf* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2007), 97-101.

authentically Welsh, against which work could be measured by placing it within this tradition.

This required the problematisation of Lewis's view of the Welsh language as a clear marker of authenticity, and so a decoupling of nationality and culture from language as such. Experience of 'being' Welsh and articulating themselves within a tradition becomes the marker of Anglo-Welsh authenticity. As in Lewis, the construction of a literary tradition stretching back before the industrial revolution becomes a means of proving its authenticity, and a means of constructing a discipline of Anglo-Welsh criticism as part of a tradition. The industrial novel was, of course a challenge to this anti-modern view. In marking out how Anglo-Welsh ideals of authenticity often implicitly share Saunders Lewis' criteria of judgement, albeit opposed to his argument on linguistic authenticity as inextricably linked to Welsh civilisation, we can indicate how a discipline of Anglo-Welsh criticism took this object of tradition as the basis for, and the work of its discipline.

The final section charts how claims of authenticity articulated in the development of Welsh pop music since the 1960s, and how language as a marker of authenticity is asserted and contested, and the effects of this. Claims of cultural authenticity – implicit and explicit – have remained in circulation throughout the development of Welsh pop music, with pressures to take particular political, aesthetic and linguistic stances. This section charts the significance of these claims and their effects while also illustrating readings of hybridity and contestation in particular pop songs.

My argument ends with the argument that notions of Welsh authenticity through language are highly problematic and contact and synergy in-between cultures needs to be emphasised. Pop culture in Wales has been able to incorporate styles and genres from rock to reggae and hip-hop, and there has always been an element of hybridity vital to its development. The relation between the particular and universal, national and intra-national, as in Lewis, is important here and indicates the convergence of globalised culture translated into the local level. However, the centrality of language in views of authentic Welsh music becomes contested in the nineties, allowing for closer contact between what may be termed Welsh and Anglo-Welsh pop. The point of such criticism is thus to understand and clarify the tensions of all such



identifications, and to bring critical analysis to bear upon the particular works that I find suggestive of these processes.<sup>466</sup>

Lewis's exhortation to 'stand in the gap' ('sefyll yn y bwlch'<sup>467</sup>) is a position of marginality from which he constructed a particular discourse, performance and tradition of Welsh identity, linking the global and local in national narrative that had vital strategic effects in avoiding an inward-looking vision of Wales. However, his claims of authenticity and authority carry dangers of exclusions of class, ethnicity and gender, as well as dangers of a calcification of culture to a selective received tradition. Rather than following the plea to stand in the gap, the question to ask may now be 'Blerwytirhwng?' ('Whereareyoubetween?') to note that in terms of identity we may always-already have been in that gap, from which it is possible to reconstruct and renew identities, to bring new myths of empowerment.<sup>468</sup>

## **Part 1: From english to English**

The title to this section comes from the analysis in Ashcroft *et al*'s analysis in *The Empire Writes Back* of how English Literature discounts some as 'english' that is, texts which do not fit into the canon.<sup>469</sup> This canon as we shall see, was linked to a particular national narrative. In relation to this hegemonic status of what constitutes 'English', Ashcroft et al place the national or marginalized literatures in the English *language* as 'english' – emphatically with a small 'e'.<sup>470</sup> This section will analyse the way the authority of 'English Literature' was constructed within particular articulations of civility, morality and language.<sup>471</sup> Terry Eagleton notes that literature can only in the end be described as that to which we (whoever 'we' may be) ascribe value.<sup>472</sup> In its construction as *English Literature* it was ascribed a moral value of

---

<sup>466</sup> *ibid*, 38-9. I would probably add to this quotation the qualification that it may be read as much a reformulation of 'nationalism' as its rejection.

<sup>467</sup> *Buchedd Garmon* (Gomer: 1957), p 47; This is a translation of the call to 'Sefwch gyda mi yn y bwlch' ('stand with me in the gap') spoken in his play

<sup>468</sup> Super Furry Animals, 'Blerwytirhwng?' on *Outspaced* (Creation records: 1998)

<sup>469</sup> B Ashcroft, G Griffiths and H Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back* (Routledge: 2002), p 203

<sup>470</sup> *ibid*

<sup>471</sup> *ibid*, p 4

<sup>472</sup> T Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Blackwell: 1983), p 10

civilising subjects. The danger to approaching marginalised literatures as marginal as such also carries the danger of ascribing too much stability and consistency to the literary ‘centre’. The lack of ‘centrality’ at the centre allows hegemonic struggles to occur.<sup>473</sup> Indicating the piecemeal construction of a formation as seemingly stable as English Literature is useful in avoiding this mistake and to allow us to analyse spaces for incorporation for other means, and so subversion. In this way we illustrate that the centre is not *there* and given, and this before our analysis of the emergence of a resistant Welsh literary theory. This avoids a simplistic view of cultural imperialism.

This requires an indication of the requirement within the construction of English Literature to undermine – or at least dethrone – the position of Classics. The movement from Classics to English Literature, carried with it a narrative of English culture as a continuation from the Classics and cosmopolitanism, that eventually linked to the particular linguistic nationalist call for ‘English for the English’.<sup>474</sup> This particular call was made using the language’s assumed moral value as a product of ‘universal’ classical civilisation. This discourse therefore asserted the particular exceptionalism of English literature as the ‘keystone’ as absolutely central to the more universal idea of ‘a liberal education’.<sup>475</sup> In this analysis it is important to note the articulation of the universal to the particular, in the sense that Laclau uses as being a requirement to construct both spaces together.<sup>476</sup> It also brings in the new with the old – the ancient perceived morality and standards of classical education now resurrected in the liberal education ‘for all’ encapsulated by ‘English’ Literature.

---

<sup>473</sup> When, for example, Ashcroft et al indicate that Rudyard Kipling may take the place of Hardy in the canon since his ‘relationship to historical and political realities may come to seem more important’ [Ashcroft et al, 2002, p 222] there is a question of a crude and rather literal positionality which is taken to be more important to one than the other (that is, closer to ‘historical and political realities’). In terms of discourse analysis, this appears to be unacceptable geographical and subject positioning, in that a place is not given but is made material (it *materialises*). Kipling’s problematic positioning in relation to India and Britain (and/or England) is certainly productive, but it appears to me that Hardy’s work may also be seen as illustrating accentual differences in a marginalized space of England (the south-west) and as illustrating a distance between the marginal and the centre ‘within’ the national space of England.

<sup>474</sup> G Sampson, *English for the English* (Cambridge University Press: 1921)

<sup>475</sup> *The Newbolt Report on the teaching of English in England* (1921) in A Bacon (ed) *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998), p 296

<sup>476</sup> E Laclau, *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality* (Verso: 2000), p 55

### From Dissenting Academies to ‘Cramming’ and ‘chatter about Shelley’

We have seen in Chapter 1 how ‘English Literature’ displaced religion to carry moral value in nineteenth century India and its being brought to bear on labouring classes domestically. However it still required several further moves to checkmate Classics in the upper echelons of higher education and ‘high culture. In late-nineteenth century Classics ruled the roost in higher learning, with English in a marginal position. In its construction, the latter could in many ways be described as a ‘Classical education in English’. It was not until the creation of the English examination as a vital component of the Indian Civil Service examination in the 1850s that the institutional importance of literature was confirmed.<sup>477</sup>

It is of course T B Macaulay who is vitally important here, and we have covered Macaulay’s view of the role of English literature in Indian education elsewhere (c.f. Chapter 1). It will suffice here to recap that he places English in a comparatively good position in relation to the Classical languages (‘What Greek and Latin were to the contemporaries of More and Ascham, our tongue is to the people of India’), and argues for ‘our own national literature’ for the role of civilising the Indian and constructing an Indian middle class in England’s own image.<sup>478</sup> Viswanathan indicates also how this is a means of displacing religion as moral instruction because of the controversies and difficulties in using Christian teachings in India, these being carried by stealth as it were in the works of Shakespeare, Dryden, Milton, Gibbon and the English canon.<sup>479</sup>

T B Macaulay argued for the pragmatic teaching of English domestically to those without the privilege of having a proper classical education, pointing to the nonsense of teaching Greek and Latin first, without teaching the mother tongue properly.<sup>480</sup> He indicates that in an ideal world, if education could be given for enough years, it would be possible to move to a properly classical education, but given the realities, he argued that it was better to provide a good English education to the many, while the

---

<sup>477</sup> D J Palmer, *The Rise of English Studies* (Oxford: 1965), p 46

<sup>478</sup> cf. Chapter 1, ‘Minute on Indian Education’, in G M Young (ed) *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952), p 724

<sup>479</sup> G Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (Columbia University Press: 1989), p 94

<sup>480</sup> T B Macaulay, *Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England* (1826) in A Bacon, p 32

most gifted few could pursue a further classical education from such a base, which linked to the ideas of meritocracy and social mobility of the middle-classes.<sup>481</sup> Macaulay's argument thus links the claims of a good liberal education with a good classical education in bringing civility, prudence and taste, and while it was better to have the latter after the former it was seen as infinitely better to have the former than a bad classical education.<sup>482</sup> Matthew Arnold would develop this view of English literature as social glue to replace the diminishing influence of religion as a civilising subject (a repetition of T B Macaulay's arguments for English literature in India applied to the domestic masses).<sup>483</sup>

In contrast to this was a concern for standards and the necessity of quantitatively established examinations, but also of movements for 'payment by results'.<sup>484</sup> It was also argued that literary 'taste' could not be measured, and so could not be examined.<sup>485</sup> In this sense, the role of the Indian Civil Service (ICS) examination came to be a stick with which to beat English literature, given that it was seen to encourage 'cramming' and to be a test of memory alone, rather than a proper means to evaluate a person's ability. Many tutors made their money from preparing students for this examination.<sup>486</sup> T B Macaulay's hope that this examination would also allow a larger Indian contingent in the ICS (one of the means to legitimate the exam on a liberal basis) also failed to materialise. It was under these ideas that battle lines were drawn between Literature and Philology for the soul of English in Cambridge.

### Tirades of Taste and Teutonism (Cambridge 1885-1918)

For a subject where 'taste' was paramount the battles for and against English literature in Cambridge must have left something rather rotten in the mouths of its

---

<sup>481</sup> *ibid.*, p 33

<sup>482</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>483</sup> M Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy and other Writings* (Cambridge University Press: 1993), p 158-60

<sup>484</sup> G E Jones and G W Roderick, *The History of Education in Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2003), p 83-4

<sup>485</sup> This is a constant refrain of the period, see especially Edward Freeman 'Literature and Language' (1887) reprinted in A Bacon (ed), *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998), p 288-9

<sup>486</sup> This included the most notorious and outspoken advocate for English Literature, John Churton Collins

participants. The controversy indicated the polarisation of the debate on the role of English Literature positioned in relation to two elements – Philology and the Classics. In response to each, it portrayed itself as more civil and more cultured than philology (although some of its champions used less than civil rhetoric), and, à la Macaulay, more practical to teach than the classics.

The controversy began with the introduction of the Merton Professorship of English Language and Literature at Oxford in 1885, the title of which gave hope to its champions of a change of emphasis to Literature.<sup>487</sup> In the event, the chair was given to a German philologist, which infuriated another candidate, the champion of English Literature, John Churton Collins.<sup>488</sup> For Collins, English meant a focus on literature and values, not philology.<sup>489</sup> The portrayal of English as a panacea against philistinism was a continuation of Matthew Arnold's attack on middle class utilitarianism, but also a precursor to C P Snow's view of the two cultures of science and arts, and the suspicion of scientific approaches as incomplete also seen in the work of T S Eliot, I A Richards and the Leavisites.<sup>490</sup> Philology was thus portrayed as coldly scientific and technical, and wholly inimical to cultivating the imagination and producing the civilised subject.

Collins thought that a proper English education at Oxford could not be complete without the Classics – their being after all the touchstones against which modern literature could be judged.<sup>491</sup> However, it is also vitally important to understand the role classics played in legitimating English literature, but also by extension, English civilisation. In this sense the role of classics as a touchstone of comparison was also a means of confirming English civilisation as a continuation of Greek and Roman knowledge and civility, and thus legitimated the British *imperium* of the world and the new imperialism. The connection of the Classics with the products of 'English Civilisation' was a means to glorifying the English genius on aesthetic-historical

---

<sup>487</sup> Edward Freeman claimed that the name given was accidental and had been supposed harmless, and that it was unfortunate that the inclusion of 'Literature' in its title gave such hope to the champions of 'English Literature' [Freeman, 'Literature and Language', p 276]

<sup>488</sup> A Bacon, *Nineteenth Century History of English Studies*, p 11

<sup>489</sup> J C Collins, *Review of 'From Shakespeare to Pope'*, in A Bacon (ed), *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998), 212

<sup>490</sup> CP Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge University Press: 1962)

<sup>491</sup> C Baldick, *The Social Mission of English Criticism 1848-1932* (Oxford: 1983), p 73

grounds. This can be seen in Collins's view of a canon of 'pure literature' of European civilisation:

What is needed...is the institution of a school which shall stand in the same relation to pure literature, to poetry, oratory and criticism, as the present school of history stands to history, and the present school of Literae Humaniores stands to philosophy...the historical and philosophical classes are most properly associated with the new. No hard-and-fast line is drawn between philosophers and historians who write in Greek and Latin, and philosophers and historians who write in English.<sup>492</sup>

It also meant the link of English development proper to the post-Renaissance era, rather than to Anglo-Saxon studies. The latter was necessarily more influenced by philology and linked to such disciplines as Celtic studies in its philological bent. Matthew Arnold inaugurated the Celtic Studies Chair in Oxford, and viewed Welsh as an important subject for antiquarian philological study, but English Literature as the essential civilising discipline and carrier of the values of civility.<sup>493</sup> It is ironic that it was this historical view of the English canon from the renaissance period within European civilisation that allowed the role of Anglo-Saxonism to also be marginalized as it did not fit into this national aesthetical history and pedagogy.

Philologists similarly attacked English Literature as lacking focus and rigour – in one memorable phrase it was portrayed as 'chatter about Shelley'.<sup>494</sup> Edward Freeman could not see English Literature as a quantifiable, examinable subject, on the basis that a candidate could only be judged on 'taste'.<sup>495</sup> This remained a problem until I A Richards' experiments in close reading, which gave English the rigour of dull routine.<sup>496</sup> By that time however, the philologists had already lost much of the momentum, not due to any particular failings on their part, but due to the perceived 'teutonism' of their subject. What had once been a compliment of rigour and rationality would become an albatross as the Germans became the enemy in the First World War. As Terry Eagleton notes 'it is a chastening thought that we owe the University study of English, in part at least, to a meaningless massacre'.<sup>497</sup>

---

<sup>492</sup> J C Collins, *Review of 'From Shakespeare to Pope'*, p 214

<sup>493</sup> M Arnold, *On the Study of Celtic Literature* (Smith, Elder & Co: 1867), p 12

<sup>494</sup> E Freeman, 'Literature and Language', p 288-9

<sup>495</sup> *ibid*

<sup>496</sup> C Baldick, *The Social Mission of English Criticism*, p 75

<sup>497</sup> T Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p 30

### A National Keystone Subject: English for the English

It required the defeat of Philology and the sidelining of the classics, arising from wartime nationalism, for these influences to culminate in the full blown confidence in the moral status of English and its role for society as seen in the Newbolt Report of 1921. It is in this document that one finds the revelation that it is English that is the 'keystone' to the 'whole' of national education – 'the use for which it, and no other, is available'.<sup>498</sup> English was thus seen as 'plainly no matter of inferior importance, nor even one among the other branches of education, but the one indispensable preliminary and foundation to all the rest'.<sup>499</sup> The First World War also created a need for a spiritual fulfilment in a secular age which many since Arnold thought was to be found in English literature. As Eagleton puts it:

England's [*sic*] victory over Germany meant a renewal of national pride, an upsurge of patriotism which could only aid English's cause; but at the same time the deep trauma of the war, its almost intolerable questioning of every previously held cultural assumption, gave rise to a 'spiritual hungering'...for which poetry seemed to provide an answer.<sup>500</sup>

The Newbolt Report saw this spiritual solution in English Literature, and saw this in explicit national terms. The tone of the report was also clearly Arnoldian, citing his authoritative statement that 'culture unites classes' and that English would have a 'unifying tendency'.<sup>501</sup> It was for also this practical reason of national unity that English was to be preferred to the Classics which are 'impossible to make use of...as a fundamental part of a national system of education'.<sup>502</sup> In a carefully written statement, the report outlines the continuity of classical education into English, before concluding the precedence of English:

We see in them [Classics] sources, which can never be forgotten, of our own language, our own art, our own experience, and we hold that no student of English will have completed his exploration, or gained all its advantages, until he has ascended the stream of literature and discovered these perennial sources

---

<sup>498</sup> 'Newbolt Report', p 296

<sup>499</sup> *ibid*, 299

<sup>500</sup> T Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p 30

<sup>501</sup> 'Newbolt Report, p 296 – Arnold's own statement is that culture 'seeks to do away with classes', which in the post Russian revolution period could be somewhat misconstrued. The report's misquotation is however closer to Arnold's own meaning.

<sup>502</sup> *ibid*, p 301

for himself. Nevertheless, we are convinced, both by necessity and by reason, that we must look elsewhere for our present purpose. The time is past for holding, as the Renaissance teachers held, that the Classics alone can furnish a liberal education. We do not believe that those who have not studied the Classics or any foreign literature must necessarily fail to win from their native English a full measure of culture and humane training. To hold such an opinion seems to us to involve an obstinate belittling of our national inheritance.<sup>503</sup>

The conclusions of the report could be summed up by the title of one of the contributors subsequent book, *English for the English*.<sup>504</sup>

The Arnoldian tone also points to the separation of art and science which a moral liberal education requires:

We believe...that formal grammar and philosophy should be recognised as scientific studies and kept apart (so far as that is possible) from the lessons in which English is treated as an art, a means of creative expression, a record of human experience.<sup>505</sup>

The report elaborates that ‘the effect of English literature is the effect of an art upon the development of human character’ which would have ‘important social, as well as personal, results’.<sup>506</sup> In this way, it is clear that the fight for the soul of English studies is the responsibility of educators, and this because of the urgent need felt to provide a moral civilising aspect to a ‘liberal education’, and thus English was to become the foundation of all other subjects. The missionary religious zeal is seen here in English, which had its inception in India, and can be seen rhetorically in the call for the ‘enrolment of itinerant preachers on English Literature’ in the Newbolt Report.<sup>507</sup> The report sees the word ‘English’ as having ‘other and wider meanings’ than merely ‘the language itself as a means of communication’.<sup>508</sup>

In this world of elevated poetry what was ‘real’ and in Leavis’s term ‘life’ was precisely that which was elevated outside the material world.<sup>509</sup> As Perry Anderson points out, what the Leavisite (as does, I A Richards’) conception of the elevated

---

<sup>503</sup> *ibid*, 305

<sup>504</sup> G Sampson, *English for the English* (1921)

<sup>505</sup> ‘Newbolt Report’, 300

<sup>506</sup> *ibid*, 307-8

<sup>507</sup> *ibid*, 310

<sup>508</sup> *ibid*, 299

<sup>509</sup> Baldick, *Social Mission of English Criticism*, p 154



literature depends upon is the preconceived idea of a 'we'.<sup>510</sup> In his writings the 'we' is always those that are already aware of the poem's redemptive qualities which reveal themselves as if by divine grace, but implicitly here only to those elected in Calvinist fashion to already understand those immanent qualities. To not understand this supposition means that one is not part of the marginal sensitive elite to whom the poem is addressed. It is in this sense that F R Leavis could famously pinpoint the nature of literary criticism with the affirmative question 'This is so, is it not?'<sup>511</sup> The danger of modernity, in media, advertising and standardisation was also seen as degrading the English language as they degrade the masses' civility. A remedy to this is the critic's elevated sensitivity. Standardised language was also seen as being disembodied from English organic 'life'.<sup>512</sup>

Baldick notes the importance of Q D Leavis's work here, and particularly the 'sociology of the herd'. He notes that her use of the term 'herd' is more flexible than 'mob' as it allows her to place the philistinism of the ruling (liberal and aristocratic) class alongside the working classes.<sup>513</sup> As Baldick also notes, this sociological view was also essentially psychological, dependent as it was on the uncritical reception of media that it took as characteristic of the 'herd'.<sup>514</sup> In this sense, then, the collapse of taste and morality is to do with the collapse of authority. Q D Leavis notes that in Shakespeare's time the lower orders were given entertainment as literature from above due to the 'organic community'.<sup>515</sup> As she says, 'thankfully, they had no choice'.<sup>516</sup> The effects of enfranchisement and democracy was to leave the mastery of the arts to the lowest common denominator – thus, the English critics' absolute disparagement of the wireless, the cinema and, in particular, advertising. For F R Leavis, the invention of the term 'high-brow' was a disastrous consequence, placing the natural leaders of culture in an embattled position with a loss of authority.<sup>517</sup>

---

<sup>510</sup> P Anderson, *English Questions* (Verso: 1992), p 98; I A Richards, *Practical Criticism* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: 1929), p 302; oddly this presumed 'we' is found too in Richard Rorty's liberal ironism in *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (Cambridge University Press), which Foucault rejects as a foundation – see introduction.

<sup>511</sup> F R Leavis, 'Literary Criticism and Philosophy: a Reply' in *Scrutiny* 6, no 1 (1937), p 62

<sup>512</sup> T Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p 42-4

<sup>513</sup> C Baldick, *Social Mission of English Criticism*, p 181, 184-5

<sup>514</sup> *ibid*, p 182

<sup>515</sup> Q D Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public* (Chatto & Windus: 1939), p 78

<sup>516</sup> *ibid*, p 79

<sup>517</sup> F R Leavis, *For Continuity* (Cambridge University Press: 1933), p 38

As Eagleton notes, the Leavisite movement was thus characterised by radicalism but also by a profound conservatism.<sup>518</sup> Its disproportionate concern with advertising indicates this problem, and is linked to the idealism of their notion of Literature. Baldick notes that Leavis ignores wholly the material world, placing the problems of the world wholly on the false and pernicious claims of advertising.<sup>519</sup> It is taken that advertising is the motor of capitalism, that it allows for the factory to run to its output capacity without which it could not gain profit – as Baldick notes, in economic terms this claim is a ‘howler’.<sup>520</sup>

It also takes the advertiser’s own word as truth, thus falling for the oldest trick of advertising – that advertising is unlikely not to advertise its own possible lack of influence.<sup>521</sup> The point for Q D Leavis to do so is that it takes the power of the Word as given, and the advertiser and consumer as one, which then allows for the Word of English to appear as a saviour.<sup>522</sup> It also means that the political and social project of English is to be in aesthetic and educational terms rather than political. English teachers were the Leavises’ revolutionary agents, the idea behind the whole of his educational teacher’s textbook, *Culture and Environment*. In effect, according to one contemporary, it meant that ‘the Decline of the West was to be avertable by close reading’.<sup>523</sup>

It is worth noting the exceptional (in both meanings of the term) construction of English here. Perry Anderson notes that the nature of English criticism was wholly opposite to that which developed in France of ‘a technical, hermeneutic criticism’.<sup>524</sup> Anderson puts this down to the vacuum created by the empiricism of English philosophy. As such, ‘one might say that when philosophy became “technical”, a displacement occurred and literary criticism went “ethical”’.<sup>525</sup> It is clear in the construction of English studies during the period outlined that it constructed itself against the technical in fields such as ‘Teutonic’ philology and so positioned itself in

---

<sup>518</sup> T Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p 33-4

<sup>519</sup> Baldick, *Social Mission of English Criticism*, p 190

<sup>520</sup> *ibid*, p 191; Baldick adds that to call it a ‘howler’ is a ‘charitable description’

<sup>521</sup> *ibid*, p 190

<sup>522</sup> *ibid*, 192

<sup>523</sup> cited in T Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, p 34

<sup>524</sup> P Anderson, *English Questions*, p 97

<sup>525</sup> *ibid*

terms of moral value which was both nationalist and linguistic. In doing so it attempted to recreate also an authoritative elite against the masses it saw rising with the democratic enfranchisement. It stayed aloof from politics outside its discipline – practicalities were to be found in literature as ‘life’.

However, the most vital part of this discourse was in placing moral value on English Literature, linking the national spirit, language, and literary tradition as a bulwark against modernity. It is also important to note the dynamic construction of the past as classical lineage as a source of authority for the exceptional moral value of English Literature and criticism. The political effect of such a linguistic nationalist aesthetic and morality when translated into the Welsh context and in Lewis’s particularly oppositional viewpoint is different, and allows for resistance with concrete social and cultural effects.

## Part 2: A Welsh Resistant National Narrative: Saunders Lewis’s Criticism

Having analysed the hybrid construction of English Literature and its construction of literature as moral value, and how that position attained institutional status it is worth looking in contrast to a particular literary criticism which had rather different subversive effects, in the cultural and social sphere, rather than as an institutionalised hegemony as such. Having seen in English Literature the attaining of dominant position, studying Saunders Lewis indicates how a strikingly similar articulation of a national tradition with moral value is constructed from a resistant position, but still complicit with ideals of class and elitism.

Saunders Lewis developed from the margins in Welsh literary criticism. It is difficult to remember this today, such is his towering presence in Welsh culture, which also spring from his political actions in Penyberth and his influence on the civil disobedience of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith* (Welsh Language Society). His work was a challenging viewpoint to the consensus of the 1920s which remained from the Edwardian period: where Liberal Wales advocated the role of the ‘gwerin’, he constructed an aristocratic view of Wales; against its individualism he advocated

community; in place of the Protestant Anglo-Celtic Empire he advocated European Latin Civilisation.<sup>526</sup> He was, and remained, a contrarian.

Criticism was a vital element in the development of his thought. As T Robin Chapman notes:

Yr oedd Lewis yn feirniad cyn bod yn wleidydd na hyd yn oed yn llenor. Ei waddol syniadol i Gymru, ac mae'n gymaint rhan o'n cynhysgaeth a'n disgwrs fel mai prin y gallwn sefyll yn ddigon pell oddi wrtho i'w weld yn glir, yw fod yn cyflwr celyddyd pob cyfnod, ac yn enwedig felly ei lenyddiaeth, yn ddrych – yn ddangoseg – i'w gyflwr ehangach.<sup>527</sup>

[Lewis was a critic before he was a politician or even a writer. His philosophical endowment to Wales, and it is such a part of our discourse that we can hardly step back from it to see it clearly, is that the state of her cultural works in each era, and this especially in her literature, is a mirror – an illustration of – her wider state.]

Chapman further notes that it was this aesthetic which made him such a divisive and problematic figure.<sup>528</sup>

The wider state he claimed as Wales' right was that of European civilisation, of the spiritually enriching culture of pre-Reformation Europe and, significantly, pre-Acts of Union Wales. This mythic narrative involved a different articulation of the relation between particular and universal, local and global, national and transnational. It was a narrative that decoupled Welsh nationality from the British state, in contrast to the Bosworth myth of Henry Tudor (Henry VII) as the last in a line of national redeemers which also included Owain Glyndwr, and so the Acts of Union as liberation from serfdom.

It was thus from a marginal position of a particular manifestation of a competing view of universal culture as a contest to that of Liberal Wales, one which saw itself as having unity in the diversity of British imperialism, of nineteenth century progress and individualism, and a Welsh nationalism which entailed a sentimental love of

---

<sup>526</sup> T Robin Chapman, *UN Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p xxii

<sup>527</sup> *ibid*, p xviii

<sup>528</sup> *ibid*, p xvi

(Welsh patron saint) St David's Day, but no political or social commitment.<sup>529</sup> Saunders Lewis played the role of contrarian to this liberal consensus. This chapter will indicate the problems of his mythic views, but also see what effects they had in performing a challenging new identity. In this, it shall indicate the authority on which his work bases itself, and how it is complicit and resistant to other discourses – positioned in relation to a dynamic constellation of relations of power.

### Educational Developments in Welsh since the 1890s

The first thing to note about the development of Welsh at the turn of the century is that it never created the polarised rift between philology and literature to the same extent as the debates at Cambridge. To a large extent this was because the role of scholarship in the Welsh department was dependent also on the need to produce published material of the texts, as well as criticism and recording of manuscripts.<sup>530</sup> The role of the Welsh scholar was therefore necessarily more holistic, closer to those of the Anglo-Saxon schools than English Literature. The focus was also therefore on the need to set up the University of Wales Press in order to better the appalling lack of published work and increase avenues for scholars to publish.<sup>531</sup>

However, that the arguments were not as bitter does not mean that there were not tensions. John Rhys was occupant of the first chair in Oxford of Celtic Studies, and the 'father of modern study in Welsh',<sup>532</sup> and his followers became Welsh teachers in colleges and schools of a clear philological bent. Along with its title, the fact that his book *Lectures in Welsh Philology* was dedicated to renowned German philologist Max Muller indicates with whom he would have sympathy in the Oxford dispute.<sup>533</sup> His pupils included John Morris-Jones, who's philology has been seen as a great step in Welsh enlightenment in standardising the language.<sup>534</sup> Morris-Jones in 1926

---

<sup>529</sup> Richard Wyn Jones, *Rhoi Cymru'n Gyntaf: Syniadaeth Plaid Cymru* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2007), p 81

<sup>530</sup> J Gwynn Williams, *The University of Wales 1893-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1996), p 146

<sup>531</sup> *ibid*

<sup>532</sup> *ibid*, p 146

<sup>533</sup> J Rhys, *Lectures in Welsh Philology* (Trubner & Co: 1877)

<sup>534</sup> S Brooks, *O Dan Lygaid y Gestapo: Yr Oleuedigaeth Gymraeg a Theori Lenyddol yng Nghymru* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2004), p 20

viewed this issue in traditional philological terms – ‘a considerable study of Welsh grammar is absolutely necessary for understanding of the older texts...Talking *about* literature is of no educational value’.<sup>535</sup>

This Philological bias was challenged. Ifor Williams and R Williams Parry led the subsequent move from a perceived over-emphasis on language and grammar, and W J Gruffydd ‘attempted to distinguish between the poetic personalities of some of its masters.’<sup>536</sup> The Haldane Commission (1916-18) noted the undue focus on the history and philology of language rather than on literature, as well as a lack of attention to literature after 1400, which it argued did not meet the needs of the students.<sup>537</sup> As W J Gruffydd noted in his review of *Cerdd Dafod*, a collection of J Morris-Jones’s work on Welsh poetry in 1925, one was then surprised by the universal focus of Morris-Jones’s work, that is in searching for general rules, which had certainly been needed in the decades before 1925, but was now old hat when the focus needed to be on difference – in other words on Welsh as art and literature.<sup>538</sup> It is in this milieu that Lewis articulates his particular view on Welsh cultural tradition and his national narrative.

Similar pronouncements could be felt in the optimistic response to the Newbolt Report that such a report based on national culture and feeling may lead to better understanding of the situation in Wales.<sup>539</sup> A year after J Morris-Jones’ comments, Saunders Lewis published his masterpiece of literary criticism, *Williams Pantycelyn*, on the great 18<sup>th</sup> century hymn and poetry writer. The work was widely expected to win the prize of book of the year at the 1928 National Eisteddfod, as Morris-Jones’s *Cerdd Dafod* had in 1926, it lost out to Dr Thomas Richards ‘Puritanism and

---

<sup>535</sup> J Gwynn Williams, *The University College of North Wales: Foundations* (University of Wales Press: 1985), p 393; Kate Roberts noted the vital importance of John Morris-Jones’ work to Welsh political nationalism, noting that he may have been surprised that his giving prestige to the language (albeit while lecturing in English) would give pride to many in the language which would feed into affiliation with Plaid Cymru a few decades later [K Roberts, ‘Atgofion am Syr John Morris-Jones’, *Barn* 22, August 1964, p 279]

<sup>536</sup> J Gwynn Williams, *The University of Wales*, p 234; P Davies, ‘His Criticism’ in A R Jones and G Thomas *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press: 1973), p 96

<sup>537</sup> J Gwynn Williams, *The University of Wales*, p 146

<sup>538</sup> W J Gruffydd, ‘Adolygiad o Cerdd Dafod’, in *Y Llenor* (4) 1925, p 188-9

<sup>539</sup> W Gareth Evans, ‘Y Wladwrieth Brydeinig ac Addysg Gymraeg’ in G H Jenkins & M A Williams *‘Eu Hiaith a Gadwant’: Y Gymraeg yn yr Ugeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000), p 338

Politics'.<sup>540</sup> For Alan Llwyd, this event signalled Lewis's central place in the battle between traditionalism and the Modernism of the new critics.<sup>541</sup> As Llwyd notes celebrating a mediocre work influenced by Puritanism was more important than a glittering work under the influence of Catholicism.<sup>542</sup> This episode indicates how Lewis was excluded from the upper echelons of Welsh education, but was a central part of its academic debates.

*Williams Pantycelyn* brought Lewis's singular aesthetic to the study of literature, which emphasised the moral and social context – the civilisation and tradition – from which a work sprang. This was a movement away from viewing author as central to the production of the text, and the text to be analysed as reflection of the author's personality. Instead the text was to be critically analysed as a repository for the critic to illuminate what the moral concerns of the age were and how it linked to a Welsh tradition.

### **Saunders Lewis and Euro-Welsh Civilisation: Organic Community and Aesthetic History**

Saunders Lewis's life and thought encompasses the greater part of the twentieth century, and cannot possibly be done justice here. His standing in Welsh nationalism is towering; his founding and leadership of Plaid Cenedlaethol Cymru (Welsh National Party – later Plaid Cymru, The Party of Wales) and his influence on Welsh language activism following his radio speech on 'The Fate of the Language' alone justify this claim. What this chapter outlines is his claims to a Welsh authenticity, and the basis on which he can claim authority as a literary critic to speak for Wales. This authority is not based on his institutional position. Although he was a leading contributor to the important journal *Y Llenor* ('The Litterateur'), he was a marginal figure academically, and following his act of civil disobedience in burning the 'bombing school' in Penyberth in 1936, was exiled from an academic position until

---

<sup>540</sup> A Llwyd, *Blynyddoedd y Locustiaid: Hanes Eisteddfod Genedlaethol Cymru 1919-1936* (Barddas: 2007), p 115-6

<sup>541</sup> *ibid*

<sup>542</sup> *ibid*

1952.<sup>543</sup> Rather, the authority to speak for Wales is analysed here and arises from his own analysis of history and tradition, aligned with his politics – it is the ambiguities and problems of his authority to speak based on his own ideas of authenticity and tradition that is of interest here.

Having grown up in Liverpool as the son of a Welsh Calvinist preacher, Lewis's background had been in English Literature at Liverpool University, interspersed with the First World War, where he had come under the influence of French Literature, especially the early work of the dilettante, symbolist and eventual conservative nationalist, Maurice Barres.<sup>544</sup> Lewis identifies these writings (along with conversations with his father) as what drove him to write literary work and criticism in Welsh.<sup>545</sup> It was French writers that led him to Welsh nationalism. As such, he retained a position as an outsider. As a result, T Robin Chapman states:

Creadigaeth ewyllus Lewis ei hun ydoedd i raddau helaeth. Wrth iddo nesau at Gymru, cadwodd led braich oddi wrthi hefyd. Nid ymgollodd erioed ynddi ac nid darganfyddiad dirfodol oedd Cymreictod oedd hi.

Lewis was his own creation to a large extent. As he came closer to Wales, he kept her at arm's length also. He did not lose himself in her and Welshness was not an existential discovery for him.<sup>546</sup>

His English literature background was also a formative part of his Welsh criticism, and there are clear parallels with how English Literature developed in constructing moral national value in a Classical tradition, and its construction in Lewis's thought. As with the Leavisites, the Newbolt Reporters et al, Lewis brought with him an analysis of the moral worth and the historic importance of literature, and how it could emerge as the saviour against a morally bankrupt materialist world of Liberal capitalism and its material mirror-image of Marxism. The preface to his *Williams Pantycelyn* begins with a quotation from T S Eliot's *The Sacred Wood*: 'The important critic is the person who is absorbed in the present problems of art, and who wishes to bring the forces of the past to bear upon the solution of these problems.'<sup>547</sup>

---

<sup>543</sup> R T Chapman, *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p 85, p 171-215, p 281-2, p 303-4

<sup>544</sup> D Glyn Jones, 'His Politics' in A R Jones & G Thomas (eds), *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press: 1973), p 23

<sup>545</sup> *ibid*

<sup>546</sup> T R Chapman, *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p xx

<sup>547</sup> T S Eliot, *The Sacred Wood* (Methuen: 1920) p 58



Indeed, this quotation defines pretty much the whole of Lewis's approach to literature, culture and politics.

The nature of the past as he saw it, on which he based the claims of a Welsh nationality can be seen in his 'ambition...to see the reestablishment of Welsh criticism on the basis of the European tradition that prospered and grew in Wales until the end of the sixteenth century'.<sup>548</sup> Lewis, in his later book, *Braslun o Hanes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg hyd at 1535* ('*Sketch of a Welsh Literary History up to 1535*') viewed the bardic tradition as following from – and flowering from – the ancient European Christian and Classical tradition, viewing the various bardic schools as developing from Platonic tradition (clearly Lewis's own preference), and later the Austinian and scholastic tradition.<sup>549</sup>

In this sense the reinvigoration of Welsh tradition through its literary tradition involved – as did the movement in English Literature – a lineage leading back (eventually) to the Classical civilisation. Welsh prestige was therefore linked to a wider European civilisation, and this was clearly meant to disavow any notion of inward-looking parochialism. It also dispensed with Arnoldian stereotypes of Celticism, as he emphasised 'our language is partly Celtic, but our literature and culture and a great part of our speech is Latin' and gloried in the fact that 'Thank the Lord, the Celt and Celtic are dead'.<sup>550</sup> The difference between Lewis's Catholic and Welsh nationalist standpoint and those of the 'English Classicists' was that for the Protestant 'dark ages' Lewis replaced pre-Reformation European classicism as the enlightened age.<sup>551</sup> Nevertheless, the structure is similar to that of English Literature in its linking with a tradition of Classical civilisation.

The advantage of this historical view was that it tied chronologically with R T Jenkins's argument that Welsh cultural decline began with the Tudors.<sup>552</sup> It is from

---

<sup>548</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn* (London, Foyle's: 1927), p 1

<sup>549</sup> S Lewis, *Braslun o Hanes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg, cyf 1: hyd at 1535* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1932)

<sup>550</sup> T R Chapman, *UN Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p 106, p 108

<sup>551</sup> It is significant that the book ends with the high point of the 'great century' of Welsh Literature of 1435-1535, just prior to the Acts of Union and barely into the English protestant reformation and Thomas Cromwell's revolution in government.

<sup>552</sup> R T Jenkins, *Yr Apel at Hanes* (Wrecsam, Hughes a'i fab: 1930), p 32-4

this background that he asserts in his *Principles of Nationalism* that the fate that ‘destroyed the civilisation of Wales...was – nationalism’, that is Tudor state nationalism.<sup>553</sup> By contrast, before that era, he notes:

For a while Europe was one, with every part of it recognizing its dependence, every country recognising that it was not free, nor had any right to govern itself as it pleased regardless of other countries. And Europe’s oneness in that age, its oneness in moral principle and under one law, protected the culture of every land and region...Welsh civilisation was safe, and the Welsh language and Welsh way of life and society.<sup>554</sup>

It is from this position that Lewis advocates a Welsh nationalism not on materialistic grounds but on ‘spiritual principles’. It requires not independence, but ‘self-government’ to ‘fight not for Wales’ independence but for Wales’ civilisation’,<sup>555</sup> and turn outsiders into Welshmen, to safeguard Welsh-speaking Wales as ‘the only civilisation that is traditional in Wales’.<sup>556</sup>

This mythic view of Welsh history and morality is linked to an ‘organic community’ as in the dominant English theories. Lewis’s *Williams Pantycelyn* is therefore an analysis of a Welsh text reflecting a Wales of which Lewis thoroughly disapproved, that is the movement toward romanticism and the foregrounding of individualist experience, feeling and sentiment. He went so far as to see Pantycelyn – with Rousseau – as the first European romantic.<sup>557</sup> While he saw in Pantycelyn that his Christian belief mitigated somewhat against the excesses of the self in romanticism, he also felt that he lived in a time in the eighteenth century when the cultural tools that would have helped him against such a slip had been lost to him by posterity, and that his grasp on tradition was in many ways an English one.<sup>558</sup> However, the shadow of that Welsh sensibility remains, and Williams’ genius is to reformulate these English protestant works into a new Welsh literary vocabulary.<sup>559</sup> In doing so, Lewis asserts that Williams is the first European romantic, bringing to the Welsh literature

---

<sup>553</sup> S Lewis, *Principles of Nationalism* (Plaid Cymru: 1975), p 5

<sup>554</sup> *ibid*, p 5-7

<sup>555</sup> *ibid*, p 9

<sup>556</sup> *ibid*, p 15

<sup>557</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn* (Foyle’s Welsh Depot: 1927), p 17

<sup>558</sup> Lewis saw in him echoes of Milton and Bunyan (*Williams Pantycelyn*, p 40).

<sup>559</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn*, p 231

the scientific principles of his time, particularly those of psychology.<sup>560</sup> In this sense, Lewis's characterisation of Williams is of a modern poet *par excellence*; but as one illustrating the cultural loss modernity brought in Wales.

I should point out here that my concern is not whether Lewis is right or not in his identification of William Williams Pantycelyn as a romantic, but rather the uses of this characterisation.<sup>561</sup> W J Gruffydd indicated how his analysis tells us more of Lewis than Pantycelyn, saying it could be better viewed as 'Pantycelyn on Lewis.'<sup>562</sup> W J Gruffydd in his review of Lewis's *Braslun* views literary analyses as landing in three sites – close analysis, historical analysis and a form of literature, whereby the author makes the material his own and imaginatively constructs a literary analysis which is often almost 'fictional'.<sup>563</sup> Lewis he takes as landing in the latter, a charge Gruffydd can then use to attack the work as being too abstract and led by his own thoughts rather than the 'facts'.<sup>564</sup> For Gruffydd, then, Lewis's literary criticism is not 'empirical' or 'historical' but artistic work of the 'imagination'.<sup>565</sup> In effect, he charges Lewis with writing an individual piece of fiction, a view that has two useful effects: first in dismissing Lewis' work as fictional and so not academic; secondly, in viewing that fiction as the product of an individual imagination, it reasserts Gruffydd's own view of artistic work.

For Lewis, Pantycelyn would plant the romantic seed from which acres of poisonous nettles would grow, of which Gruffydd's own liberal standpoint would be an example. What saves Pantycelyn is that his romanticism was that he was not a Puritan, unlike, Lewis contends, most of his successors to the twentieth century.<sup>566</sup> It is therefore his notion, experience and understanding of sin that is important. Here, Lewis's attack on Puritanism strongly echoes – albeit in a more religious idiom – those of Q D Leavis who attacks the censoring of great literature such as Joyce and D H Laurence on the

---

<sup>560</sup> *ibid*, p 53

<sup>561</sup> W J Gruffydd, 'Adolygiad o Braslun o Hanes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg,' *Y Llenor* (11), 1932, p 249-250

<sup>562</sup> *ibid*

<sup>563</sup> *ibid*

<sup>564</sup> *ibid*

<sup>565</sup> *ibid*

<sup>566</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn*, p 158

grounds of their 'filth'.<sup>567</sup> His notion of sin is in fact a psychological defence of the organic community as a means toward spiritual and psychological salvation that he asserts is impossible under the individualist chimera of romanticism and, implicitly, liberalism.

#### **Social Sin and Psychology: the need for organic community**

Lewis's use of the concept of sin is useful in order to understand his views of the organic community, literature and the artist's freedom, and the authority on which he is able to assert the supremacy of the organic community in asserting moral and psychological salvation. Here, Lewis characteristically posits the work of the *seiat* (fellowship meeting) of Welsh Methodism as fulfilling the role of the Catholic confession, lost since the Protestant reformation, of shedding light upon sin and the flesh.<sup>568</sup> Williams is thus seen as reviving what had been lost in Protestantism, albeit in an incomplete way, in making the role of sin important at the social level rather than at the individual's morality.<sup>569</sup>

Lewis analyses Williams' understanding of love and lust to indicate how he does not fall into Puritanism, characterised by a simplistic rejection of sin simply as wrong. Lewis's own use of psychoanalysis sees sin rejected consciously in such a fashion is pushed into the unconscious only to re-emerge as it were from darkness. It is in this fashion that Lewis sees Williams as continuing in a spirit of critical inquiry the work on the self – that which falls into the unknowable darkness (the unconscious) is that which is to fall under critical inquiry, or 'introspection'.<sup>570</sup> In Lewis's startling formulation, Williams's work pre-empts that of Freud by a hundred and fifty years in this respect!<sup>571</sup>

Lewis's use of psychoanalysis is theologised, in that the psyche is collapsed into the body through the soul. This is seen in Lewis's preference for the translation of

---

<sup>567</sup> Q D Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public*, p 9; Leavis is referring to the attitudes of circulating libraries here

<sup>568</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn*, p 42-3

<sup>569</sup> *ibid*

<sup>570</sup> *ibid*, p 52

<sup>571</sup> *ibid*, p 122

‘psychology’ as ‘eneideg’ rather than, as was in use at the time, ‘meddyleg’.<sup>572</sup> This use led to discussions of the term in *Y Llenor*, with many pointing out that ‘meddyleg’ was a far more strictly narrow term than ‘eneideg’, pertaining to the mind (‘meddwl’) only. It was admitted by proponents of this particular translation that it misrepresented the use of the word ‘psyche’ in many prominent psychological theories, especially of psychoanalysis. ‘Eneideg’, however, took a far wider view of subjectivity linked to the word ‘soul’ (‘enaid’), what one writer translated as ‘soul-lore’.<sup>573</sup>

Foucault similarly charts the disciplining of the soul and constructs the confession as a means of disciplining subjects through their own introspection and social speech, and links the confession to psychoanalytical treatment.<sup>574</sup> Lewis is asserting a similar relation to ‘sin’ as Foucault here, as a means toward morality – while in Foucault this authority is a means of discipline, for Lewis it is vital to spiritual well-being. This view of ‘soul’ and the search for depth through introspection of the subject in a social community mirrors the role of the critic, the text and history. It is from the position of the analyst that he can assert that the material social condition can be collapsed into the text in itself and understood by the literary critic, as seen in his writing on Dafydd Nanmor and ‘the Great Century’ of literature in Wales, where he takes his work to be praise to the aristocratic ideals of Catholic Wales and those who were its leaders helped create a stable community and nation.<sup>575</sup>

The use of sin in Lewis is not merely that of an internal drive but an encounter with an other that produces sinful drives. It is in this vein that he attacks the view of the romantic artist as separate from society, as producing from within the depths of the self. In seeing the romantic self as the producer of work, and the artist’s role as exploring the recesses of the self and experience as the genus of all genuine artistry, this dismisses a real encounter with sin and the social environment. Implicitly, he posits that the puritan attack on the individual who sins as moral failure misunderstands the relation of sin and the self, and the proper understanding of sin

---

<sup>572</sup> *ibid*, p 7

<sup>573</sup> R I Aaron, ‘Ar gyfieithu’r gair “Psychology”’, in *Y Llenor* (8), 1929, p 243; D Miall Edwards, “‘Meddyleg’ ynteu “Eneideg”’, in *Y Llenor* (9), 1930 p 41-6

<sup>574</sup> M Foucault, *The history of Sexuality vol 1: The Will to Knowledge* (Penguin: 1998), p 67

<sup>575</sup> S Lewis, ‘Dafydd Nanmor’ in *Y Llenor* (Oct 1925), p 141

must be a social one, not one of repression.<sup>576</sup> Here he views sin in the puritan view as repressing into the unconscious something which must then come out in one monstrous form or other from the natural unconscious drives.<sup>577</sup> In this sense, the organic community and society is a good in itself as a safeguard and a process of moral learning. The implied movement from Welsh organic communitarianism to romantic individualism was therefore a psychological and moral loss in this characterisation.

This view of the role of sin and authority indicates how Lewis moves away from sin as an individual act as such to its inscription of meaning in social activity. Utilising psychology he thus sees the role of the individual as unearthing that which is in the unconscious thought through the social – confession rather than repression. This is why the organic community is so important – the individual is insufficiently prepared for continual psychological (and, here, theological) drives or traumas. It is for this reason that romanticism and Puritanism with their emphasis are seen to provide little theoretical defence against such harm, and this constructs a further defence of his view of national civilisation.

### **Cultural Authority and Speaking For Wales**

This social psychology can also be linked to his anti-censorship stance, as to understand sin one cannot simply repress it, or denounce individual sin as moral failure; it must be worked out socially. This is also how he sees the role of sin for the artist and in literature, as clearly playing a part in moral development and civility. He attacks literature in Wales as totally ignoring sin, and as such Wales becomes a land of nonconformists where each ‘nonconforms with everyone else’.<sup>578</sup> Using France as an example, he wishes for more atheist writers rather than a suspicion of heresy, as he sees atheists as having been through a more meaningful and self-aware encounter with God (and so, sin) in order to reject him.<sup>579</sup> It is clear here that Lewis is drawing on his reading of Kierkegaard in the trenches, as it is an almost identical viewpoint of sin as

---

<sup>576</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn*, p 158, 166, 171

<sup>577</sup> *ibid*, p 166

<sup>578</sup> S Lewis, ‘Letter on Catholicism’ (1927), in Harri Pritchard Jones *Saunders Lewis: a Presentation of his Work* (Templegate: 1990), p 42

<sup>579</sup> *ibid*, p 42-3

that in the latter's *The Sickness unto Death*.<sup>580</sup> Nevertheless, the point of artistic freedom here is – as in the seiat and Pantycelyn's own spiritual development – in order to advance the self-consciousness of sin in society, and so advance society as a whole. Lewis's notion of (artistic) freedom and development is therefore tied to his view of sin. This freedom is however, again, highly aestheticised and takes place in an ordered, hierarchic world.

Like the Leavises, who could be extremely radical on the one hand, and extremely conservative on the other, Lewis's psycho-theological sociology meant that he was aiming at what he viewed as materialism of all political hues. This led him to view certain people as the 'we' of the nation against those who were not (or not yet). Those who were not part of the organic and Welsh speaking community were incomplete. In one of his most hard-line and contentious essays 'Un Iaith i Gymru' ('One Language for Wales'), he describes the need to rid Wales of the English language entirely:

Yr ydym am ryddhau Cymru o afael y Saeson. Yr ydym am anseisnigeiddio Cymru. Purion. Y peth mwyaf Seisnig sydd ar elw y Saeson yw Saesneg. Ni allwn, gan hynny, amcanu at ddim llai na difodi Saesneg yng Nghymru....Drwg, a drwg yn unig, yw bod Saensneg yn iaith lafar yng Nghymru. Rhaid ei ddileu o'r tir a elwir Cymry; *defenda est Carthago*.<sup>581</sup>

[We wish to free Wales from the hands of the English. We wish to deenglishify Wales. So be it. The most Anglicised thing the English have in their armoury is English [as in language]. We cannot, for that reason, aim for anything less than ending English [language] in Wales...It is evil, and an evil only, that English is a spoken language in Wales. It must be removed from the land called Wales; *defenda est Carthago*]

The problems of this contentious view of cultural authenticity barely need repeating, in its view of a pure identity linked to a language, and its perceived need to drive out impurity. However, it is interesting to note the authority cited for the English language's evil. Lewis cites 'an expert' who states that English 'is the best language in the world in which to advertise', which he takes to indicate that language's shame.<sup>582</sup> The book he cites as 'an argument throughout for removing the English language from Wales' is F R Leavis's *Culture and Environment*. He takes from this book the fact that the English language is the carrier of modernity and capitalism and

<sup>580</sup> S Kierkegaard, *The Sickness Unto Death* (Penguin: 1984)

<sup>581</sup> S Lewis, *Canlyn Arthur* (Gomer: 1938), p 62-3

<sup>582</sup> *ibid*

a means for dilution and decimating identity; while Leavis et al aim to avert this by a focus on the English canon as a civilising subject, Lewis turns it as a means of asserting the authority of the Welsh European aesthetic tradition as a defence against modernity exemplified in the English language itself.

The English language is thus given the identity of modernity, capital, corruption and so on, which is precisely what must be defended against with the moral value of the Welsh language and literature. The link between organic community, mythic Europe history and decoupling from British Empire is seen in his essay 'Lloegr ac Ewrop a Chymru' ['England and Europe and Wales']:

Ond ym Mhrydain a oes traddodiad Ewropeaidd? A oes yma genedl a fu'n rhan wreiddiol o wareiddiad y Gorllewin, yn meddwl yn null y Gorllewin ac yn gallu deall Ewrop a chydymdeimlo a hi? Yr ateb yw: Cymru. Y Cymry yw'r unig genedl ym Mhrydain a fu'n rhan o Ymerodraeth Rufain, a sugnodd laeth y Gorllewin yn faban, a chanddi waed y gorllewin yn ei gwythienau. Fe all Cymru ddeal Ewrop, canys y mae hi'n un o'r teulu...Ni bu'r Ymerodraeth [Brydeinig] ond enw iddi a swm disystyr.<sup>583</sup>

[But is there in Britain a European tradition? Is there a nation here that was an original part of Western civilisation, which thinks in the Western method and can understand Europe and symbolise with her? The answer is: Wales. The Welsh are the only nation in Britain that was once part of the Roman Empire, that suckled the Western milk as a baby, since she is one of the family...the [British] was never anything but a name with a nonsensical sound to it.]

This indicates how this view attempts to decouple Wales and the Welsh from the British Empire through antiquity and the link of Welsh culture to Classical civilisation.

Also like the Leavises, Lewis has scant regard for the 'herd' – the masses, or the elites in power. In such a viewpoint, the assertion is that there is a more enlightened elite with roots in the past, who had the imagination to see the traditional way of life, to uproot from the present and root themselves in the past via literary criticism and a national aesthetic. Against a liberal consensus in Wales, Lewis advocated the importance of hierarchical order, a social aristocracy, as seen in the days of Dafydd Nanmor, against the lack of culture of democracy and (especially) proletarian

---

<sup>583</sup> *ibid*, p 31



industrialism.<sup>584</sup> It is a displacing context with a view of literary tradition in which the artist as critic judges whether one does or does not conform to that tradition.

However, in Wales, this aesthetic involved a politicisation of culture and a contestation of a Welsh national narrative that challenged that of liberal Wales in a so-called Anglo-Celtic Empire. Lewis's viewpoint politicised culture, including the Welsh language, in opposition to the sentimentalised Celticist narrative of Edwardian Wales and the complacent view of nineteenth century social progress destroyed in the fields of the Somme. Lewis's activism follows on from this. The trope of suffering that occurs in Welsh nationhood to at least Gwynfor Evans' hunger strike, was a mythic and religious trope.<sup>585</sup> As T Robin Chapman suggests, Lewis was attracted to the Catholic Church because of its theatrical element, of 'faith as performance.'<sup>586</sup> This element of civic disobedience played with such self-sacrifice, aimed at particular symbols, in Pen-y-bent, the encroachment of the British military into the Welsh heartlands.<sup>587</sup> Symbolism and performance was a means, as in the theatre and poetry he espoused against Ibsen's realism of moving toward the spiritual rather than the material.<sup>588</sup> The performance of suffering was a desperate means to symbolise a resistance aesthetically, to contest the spaces of Wales (or place and Welshness), and to place an other Wales in their midst, 'to speak both of, and as, the minority, the exilic, the marginal and the emergent.'<sup>589</sup> As Bhabha notes of the performance as a rupture in national narratives:

It becomes a question of the otherness of the people-as-one. The national subject splits in the ethnographic perspective of culture's contemporaneity and provides both a theoretical position and a narrative authority for marginal voices or minority discourses...[the question becomes] 'What are we today?'<sup>590</sup>

---

<sup>584</sup> Lewis's poem 'The Deluge' illustrates his dismissal of the latter culture, to which we shall return in the next section.

<sup>585</sup> R Evans, *Gwynfor Evans: Rhag Pob Brad Lofa* (2005), p 427-448

<sup>586</sup> T R Chapman, *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p 119

<sup>587</sup> on the role of Pen-y-bent as constructing a Welsh space as 'colonised' and to be defended, see Pyrs Gruffudd 'Yr Iaith Gymraeg a'r Dychymyg Daearyddol 1918-1950' in '*Eu Hiaith a Gadwant*?' *Y Gymraeg yn yr Ungeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000), p 120-5

<sup>588</sup> T R Chapman, *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer*, p 57

<sup>589</sup> H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, p 149

<sup>590</sup> *ibid*, p 150

This rupture arises from the contestation in Lewis's aesthetic national history, and is not anterior to it. It is what allows his act to contest narratives and spaces as they were conceived in the hegemonic consensus of Edwardian Liberal Wales.

The claim to authority to speak for Wales arises from authenticity and identity as posited by Lewis's own national narrative. Like all narratives, it has amnesias and exclusions. One finds in Lewis's view of the cinema and popular culture echoes of the Leavises dislike of herdish mentality which they see in the industrial age's culture, where they see the role of technological culture as creating merely automatons receiving images and sounds without the civilising aspects of high culture. Indeed, one can clearly link Lewis's elitism with his anti-censorship and elevation of the artist and litterateur in his later review of Oscar Wilde's letter in 1962, where he quotes from a letter by Wilde answering whether he would marry again:

As regards my marrying again, I am quite sure that you will want me to marry this time some sensible, practical, middle-aged boy, and I don't like the idea at all. Besides, I am practically engaged to a fisherman of extraordinary beauty, age eighteen. So you can see there are difficulties.<sup>591</sup>

To this Lewis notes 'anyone who cannot delight in the sheer mischief of that ought to leave literature alone and go and play bingo'<sup>592</sup>, which seems to encapsulate Lewis's view of sin and morals, elitist artistic freedom and the masses in one pithy sentence.

It is through the idea of imagination within the elevated artist that a viewpoint of genius, and of leadership, arises, and so a certain form of individualism – but also authority – returns. Individual artistry is here shorn of its romantic and puritan implications, as it must arise in the *reception* of 'a' literary tradition. As in Eliot, the individual artist must channel the tradition, and his writing becomes a means of transforming and revitalising the tradition.<sup>593</sup> He asserts anti-censorship for this artist to explore sin, but only in his role as a genius who may help us understand sin, and thus bring moral value and a deepening of morals for the nation.

---

<sup>591</sup> S Lewis, 'Forever Oscar' (1962), in H Pritchard Jones (ed) *Saunders Lewis: A Presentation of His Work* (Templegate Publishers: 1990), p 202

<sup>592</sup> *ibid*

<sup>593</sup> T S Eliot, *The Sacred Wood* (Methuen: 1920)

In this viewpoint, 'literature' becomes displaced of particular context and becomes its own justification from the authorised position of the critic – s/he who is in the tradition is literary by definition. It is also an elitist and conservative view of the individual genius – Lewis noted of writing that it is a reflection of the self, and if what one writes is bad then this does not reflect well on the writer.<sup>594</sup> The high literature artist becomes the channel for and prophet of a communitarian culture – here we see the collapsing of both meanings of culture in Raymond Williams' analysis, both of 'a culture', and culture as 'high culture' of the elite.<sup>595</sup> Who speaks for Wales is thus the intelligentsia of 'high culture', which is taken to stand for Welsh culture as a whole. As Raymond Williams notes, when he asserts of the industrial heartlands in South Wales 'here once was Wales' he is also asserting that it is not Wales now.<sup>596</sup> Raymond Williams also notes how 'Welshness had the function of Englishness in Leavis' for Lewis as 'a stand of old values against a destructive industrial civilisation.'<sup>597</sup> The spaces opened by the question 'what are we to-day?' is closed by excluding those who do not fit the original model of 'that which we were in those days.' It is the need for original authenticity that is problematic here.

Lewis thus constructed a view of a national literature that derived its power from a view of tradition extremely similar to that of English Literature, which also utilised a classical view of European civilisation to add to the prestige of the national tradition. This viewpoint required the sense of an aesthetic history based on an ideal of 'Welsh Literature' and its language that the properly Welsh artist utilised as a critique of the present. The role of the artist as channelling this tradition was also structurally necessary to his national viewpoint as a whole, in order to avoid the role of the literary critic merely as the antiquarian, as Matthew Arnold saw Celtic studies.

Lewis's views on literature drew heavily on the moralistic and civilising view of this national literary history in similar ways to the construction of English Literature. However, translated into the different position of Welsh-language literature, this position had different effects – according to one critic Lewis was a 'one-man national

---

<sup>594</sup> S Lewis, *Williams Pantycelyn*, p 27

<sup>595</sup> R Williams, *Keywords* (Fontana: 1976), p 92

<sup>596</sup> R Williams 'Remaking Welsh History' in D G Williams *Who Speaks for Wales* (University of Wales Cardiff: 2003), p 69

<sup>597</sup> R Williams, 'Community' in D G Williams *Who Speaks for Wales?* (University of Wales Press: 2003), p 29

bourgeoisie' in elevating the importance of Welsh national literature.<sup>598</sup> The heavily aesthetic, elitist, with its focus upon importance of the psycho-moral well-being of a nation and the 'literature' displacing 'life', led Welsh nationalism to what may be termed a culturalist bias. In asserting its moral value in the organic community, which could be used against sin and so the moral (as well as linguistic) corruption of Wales, he was asserting the theological and moral value of Welsh Literature, as the Welsh good life. In constructing this tradition and placing the 'true' critic as arising from that tradition, he asserted the authority of the literary critic to speak for Wales (as the 'we' who already understand, in Leavisite terms). This discourse of tradition, language and authority would continue to have a profound influence on the priority of culture (and its authenticity) in Welsh politics and in its role in constructing and disciplining Welsh subjectivity through to Anglo-Welsh Criticism.

### Part 3: Quandaries of Welshness: The Construction of 'Anglo-Welsh' Tradition

In 1938, Saunders Lewis brought his critical skills to bear on Anglo-Welsh Literature, an important intervention that questioned the terms on which that discipline could be based. The irony lies in the fact that his answer to the title of his lecture 'Is there and Anglo-Welsh literature' was in the negative.<sup>599</sup> Nevertheless, it seems that Anglo-Welsh critics<sup>600</sup> have felt compelled to address such concerns of authentic Welshness, even in order to refute the basis of language as such as a marker of authenticity, illustrating the problems of defining both 'Welsh' and 'Anglo'. In this sense, even while dismissing such arguments Anglo-Welsh critics remained within the ambit of these concerns for definition of Anglo-Welsh literature – essentially the question is 'how Welsh can a text in English be?' and following this with 'how Welsh is a particular artist?'

The definition of Welshness in these arguments follows unspoken assumptions similar to those of Lewis himself, of a wish to show Wales as an organic (but bilingual) community, of the pre-industrial antiquity of Anglo-Welsh, and to understand its

---

<sup>598</sup> Gareth Miles. 'A Personal View', in A R Jones & G Thomas, p 18

<sup>599</sup> S Lewis, *Is there an Anglo-Welsh Literature?* (University of Wales Press: 1939), p 13

<sup>600</sup> This term is highly fraught – here I shall refer to Anglo-Welsh Literature critics as those who define themselves and the field as such.

concerns as Welsh in spirit and subject matter, if not in language. The discipline of Anglo-Welsh Literature is therefore an attempt to re-read Lewis's tradition without the necessity of the Welsh language as intrinsic to Welsh civilisation. As Wynn Thomas notes, 'leading male Anglo-Welsh writers of the post-war period could well be designated the sons of Saunders.'<sup>601</sup> This could also be said for Anglo-Welsh criticism, if not as followers of Lewis, then as working with similar criteria of judgement within what is a received national tradition (received by the critic).

The main challenge to this traditional viewpoint was that of 'industrial Wales', which asserted its importance as writing as part of industrial modernity and an authentic voice for the majority of the Welsh, which in its own asserts its communitarian basis on a similar – although on a different class basis – authority. It links itself with the English language as a different culture, as modern and international, in opposition to what it sees as the backward traditionalism of rural Wales. As we have seen in Lewis's work, this characterisation of inward-looking nationalism as only local and particular does not hold; however, it is interesting to note the ways in which these claims for authenticity work, and useful to use the postcolonial debate between Chinua Achebe and Ngugi wa Thiong'o' to grasp these problems and indicate how a move away from such signifiers of authenticity has been necessary.

### **Questioning Anglo-Welsh Literature**

Lewis's tract is wholly consistent with his anti-modern, anti-materialist standpoint outlined above, and indeed serves the useful purpose of allowing him to outline his points on Welsh literature in opposition to (for him) a deficient one – namely 'Anglo-Welsh literature', which he essentially places under the category 'English literature'. For Lewis, there is nothing distinctively Welsh about this literature – as he says of Dylan Thomas 'there is nothing hyphenated [i.e. Anglo-Welsh] about him. He belongs wholly to the English'.<sup>602</sup>

---

<sup>601</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures: The Two Literatures of Wales* (University of Wales Press: 1999), p 52

<sup>602</sup> S Lewis, *Is There an Anglo-Welsh Literature*, p 5

Given Lewis's own admiration of the Irish renaissance and so 'Anglo-Irish' writing, this position appears contradictory. The explanation lies in Lewis's view of an organic society as pre-industrial and anti-materialist, where a national culture 'grows up'. Irish and Scottish writing in English has had the advantage of having an autonomous tradition stretching back centuries.<sup>603</sup> Clearly, therefore, this could create a tradition prior to the standardising effects of the industrial age that he sees as inimical to constructing a properly literary tradition.<sup>604</sup> Ironically, therefore, it is because both the Irish and Scottish had purportedly lost their languages before the industrial age as a high cultural idiom (in contrast to Wales, where the language survived) that the role of English in their respective cultures could build a truly national literature in English.<sup>605</sup>

Lewis's view then was that the advent of industrialism and modernity, with its 'levelling-down' tendencies and standardisation, made the construction of new tradition impossible. Implicitly, this also meant that he saw modernity as firmly linked with English (or perhaps Anglo-American) literature, given that he could view those 'Anglo-Welsh' writers as writing within this ambit. Properly Welsh (as Welsh-language) tradition could form a barrier against the intrusion of modernity and its standardising impulses, which is why he strove to 'protect' traditional Welsh-speaking communities against bilingualism.<sup>606</sup>

This antagonism against the 'Anglo-Welsh' is also notoriously seen in Lewis's poem 'The Deluge' which savagely describes the industrial South Wales proletariat as 'a culture of grease', and in whose voice he announces 'We command no language or dialect, unconscious of insult/ And the masterpiece we gave history is our land's MPs'.<sup>607</sup> This antagonism between the literatures of the two languages had been plain since Caradoc Evans's sensationalist masterpiece *My People*, which in terms rather similar to Lewis's later attack on the industrial south he attacked nonconformist rural Wales as a sort of hypocritical theocracy where pious morality hid a multitude of sins

---

<sup>603</sup> *ibid*, p 10-1

<sup>604</sup> *ibid*

<sup>605</sup> *ibid*, p 10-1

<sup>606</sup> S Lewis, *Canlyn Arthur* p 61-5

<sup>607</sup> S Lewis, 'The Deluge', in A R Jones and G Thomas (eds) *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press), p 177-9

and exploitation.<sup>608</sup> W J Rees has noted striking factual similarities between Evans's work and those of the positive idealised view of rural Wales of D J Williams' *Hen Dy Fferm* (*The Old Farmhouse*), which indicate simply how what one viewpoint takes as idealised organicism and natural hierarchy becomes a mask of exploitation in the other.<sup>609</sup> As M Wynn Thomas has pointed out, Evans's attacks were not dissimilar to his Welsh language contemporaries.<sup>610</sup> Wynn Thomas points to examples such as R Williams Parry's poem *Y Llwynog* (*The Fox*) as appealing to nature proper against Nonconformist piety, a movement he sees also in the work of Dylan Thomas.<sup>611</sup>

As Kirsti Bohata notes, the ferocious reaction to Evans's work was not due to its criticism as such but rather that its medium expression was aimed at audiences outside Wales, and that its barbed criticisms and idioms were thus seen as aimed toward a jeering metropole (Evans constructed a savage Anglicised version of Welsh speech of comic absurdity).<sup>612</sup> Given the polarised debates around Caradoc Evans, it is clear that any construction of a discipline of Anglo-Welsh literary criticism was difficult – ironically given his image as arch-nationalist and derider of all things Anglicised, it was made in Saunders' image, and in response to his own inauguration of critical debate.

### Constructing Anglo-Welsh Tradition

Anglo-Welsh literature practitioners have felt the need to place themselves within the discourse of Welsh-language literature as tradition, in attempting to illustrate the antiquity of Welsh writing in English. It is in the post-war era where we begin to see works of literary criticism on this literature by practitioners in the field, of which's fruits are seen Glyn Jones's *The Dragon has Two Tongues*, and the work of Roland Matthias and Raymond Garlick. Prior to this, the ambiguities of the Anglo-Welsh position are encapsulated in the fact that the founder and editor of the first Anglo-Welsh journal in this period of renaissance in the thirties was Keidrych Rhys, who

<sup>608</sup> C Evans, *My People* (Seren: 2003)

<sup>609</sup> W J Rees, 'Inequalities: Caradoc Evans and D J Williams' in *Planet* 81; D J Williams *Hen Dy Fferm* (Aberystwyth: 1963)

<sup>610</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures* (University of Wales Press: 1999), p 49-50

<sup>611</sup> *ibid*

<sup>612</sup> K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited* (University of Wales Press: 2005), p 106-7

took the position that Anglo-Welsh writing was a way back to using Welsh as the only medium of expression in all matters literary.<sup>613</sup>

These works, as befits the work of practitioners who aim at popularising and delineating their respective field, contain much works of personal biography as a means of analysing texts, including (especially in the work of Glyn Jones) much in the way of personal reminiscences. This personal access makes for much that is engaging, and is clearly also implicitly meant to be taken to mean that such personal relationships serve to allow greater insight into the poetry, particularly one thinks given that the link is between practitioners of Anglo-Welsh Literature. The aim is often at deciding how Welsh (or not) a writer is, according to the simple criteria best summed up in Mathias's pithy view of any writer who chooses to 'write in English out of a firmly Welsh background'.<sup>614</sup>

This 'firmly Welsh background', however, requires a tradition to sustain it, and it is this point where Garlick and Mathias's work is important in giving credibility to an Anglo-Welsh tradition centuries older than that which Lewis assumed, and dismissed.<sup>615</sup> As Wynn Thomas puts it:

Along with Raymond Garlick, Mathias has been responsible for a remarkable exercise in cultural archaeology. Together they have painstakingly unearthed evidence of a continuous record of English-language writing indigenous to Wales that stretches back to the Middle Ages. The recovery of such a record has been of vital importance for their sense of modern Welsh writing in English (to which they have both made valuable contributions) as being heir to a centuries-old Welsh 'tradition' of Anglophone writing.<sup>616</sup>

This established the pre-industrial origins of Anglo-Welsh Literature, vital to a literary tradition viewed through similar lenses as Lewis. In a Lewisian vein this foundation allows them to place writers – or individual works of artists – in a continuum of more or less Welsh, according to their place in that literary tradition.

---

<sup>613</sup> J Harris, 'Rhyfel y Tafodau: Ymatebion Eingl-Gymraeg Cynnar i Ddiwylliant Llenyddol Cymru' in G H Jenkins and M A Williams *'Eu Hiaith a Gadwant'? Y Gymraeg yn yr Ungeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru), p 427-8

<sup>614</sup> R Mathias, *A Ride Through the Wood* (Poetry Wales Press: 1985), p 243; T S Eliot *The Sacred Wood*, p 28

<sup>615</sup> R Garlick, *An Introduction to Anglo-Welsh Literature* (University of Wales Press: 1970); R Mathias, *Anglo-Welsh Literature: An Illustrated History* (Poetry Wales Press: 1987)

<sup>616</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures*, p 11



Garlick here quotes from Eliot's 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' of the poet's importance: 'His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead'.<sup>617</sup> While there is a clear denial that there is a particular identity to be aimed for, these works all follow the basic didacticism of Glyn Jones:

What I myself would welcome in Anglo-Welsh writers is, as I have said, a wider knowledge of the past and present of our country, particularly of our native literature, and a deeper sense of identity with her destiny. This would surely result ultimately in closer unity between Welsh and Anglo-Welsh, so that the two groups could recognise each other as Welshmen and not merely as antagonists. I would welcome a rejection of London or New York as the literary capital of Wales, and the appearance not only of better poets and novelists than we have already produced, but also – this we lack – critics of sensitivity and responsibility. I would like Anglo-Welsh writers to see themselves first as Welshmen. The only English thing about an Anglo-Welsh writer ought to be his language.<sup>618</sup>

The assumption that one can 'be' English as such is taken as given, and that clear borders can be demarcated between English and Welsh cultures.

In this idea of identity and tradition it is clear that (at least) one figure becomes highly problematic – Dylan Thomas. The above quote indicates why he would be problematic, actively rejecting the provincialism of Swansea for the metropolis of London and New York, and seeking out an image as individualist bohemian.<sup>619</sup> He was quite happy for his name to be pronounced in the English fashion ('Dillon' rather than the proper 'Dull-anne').<sup>620</sup> As Wynn Thomas notes, Mathias, along with such luminaries as Jeremy Hooker and Tony Conran see the influence of Anglo-American poetry on Dylan Thomas as 'both morally suspect and deeply un-Welsh'.<sup>621</sup> Glyn Jones similarly sees his imagery of the poet as individuated genius as going against the grain of Welsh traditions of communitarianism.<sup>622</sup>

Nevertheless, one senses the need by these critics to accommodate Thomas in their framework (paradoxically for this framework of 'Welshness first', and in contrast

---

<sup>617</sup> R Garlick, *An Introduction to Anglo Welsh Literature*, p 48; T S Eliot, *The Sacred Wood*, p 48-9

<sup>618</sup> G Jones, *The Dragon has Two Tongues* (J M Dent & Sons Ltd), p 208

<sup>619</sup> *ibid*, p 188

<sup>620</sup> *ibid*, p 178

<sup>621</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures*, p 35

<sup>622</sup> G Jones, *The Dragon has Two Tongues*, p 188n

with Ireland, not least because there are few luminaries of international repute in Anglo-Welsh writing). Therefore excavation is made of the examples of place names and poems that began their life in Wales, of which Mathias claims there are over half of his output, subsequently redrafted, and of the moments in his work where one finds some reactions to nonconformist Wales ('After the Funeral' being one clear example of the funeral of his Aunt Ann).<sup>623</sup> It is useful to note, Dylan Thomas' own position here, as he saw 'Anglo-Welsh' as an ambiguous compromise.<sup>624</sup> Wynn Thomas has analysed Thomas' reading of Henry Vaughan as indicating a 'supranational Modernism with national pedigree'.<sup>625</sup> On the model of James Joyce signing off with 'Dublin 1904; Trieste 1914', Vaughan was important to Thomas 'precisely to the extent that he was a Welshman who had written good poetry that was *not* recognisably Welsh in character.'<sup>626</sup>

The problem here is one of attempting to view a culture as properly 'authentic' and how artists measure up to this cultural tradition uncontaminated by modernity. It is in this sense that Homi Bhabha's view of hybridity as being that we are all in liminal states is vital. It is important to reiterate what 'hybridity' is *not* here. Its unfortunate biological implications would lead one here to possibly view 'Anglo-Welsh' literature as a hybrid as a product of other things – that is, as a bastard child of English and Welsh literature. The hybrid nature of many writers in this position is often noted on a personal biographical level, but 'the psycho-cultural significance of such cross-overs has hardly begun to be explored'.<sup>627</sup>

This semi-organicist construction of 'Anglo-Welsh' tradition implicitly underpins and undermines its own label. The discipline required a traditional authenticity and criteria of judgement that is similar to Saunders Lewis, even while fervently trying to deny the importance of linguistic authenticity. Nevertheless, its incorporation indicates the flexibility of the discourse and how it could be used beyond any inward-looking view of Welsh tradition, albeit with the thorny issue of the language excised to a considerable degree. It retained the element of demarcating what was and was not

---

<sup>623</sup> R Mathias, *A Ride Through the Wood*, 65-67

<sup>624</sup> *ibid*, p 29

<sup>625</sup> *ibid*

<sup>626</sup> *ibid*

<sup>627</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures*, p 50

‘Welsh’ as a badge of authenticity within an aesthetic literary tradition. However, it indicated how the discourse of linguistic and national authenticity could be incorporated and subverted from a marginal position, this time in order to have authority to speak for Anglo-Welsh Literature.

### **Competing Authenticities: Traditions of ‘modernity’ and ‘anti-modernity’ and the In-Between**

There is another viewpoint of authenticity which rejects this formulation of ‘Anglo-Welsh’ – one that can be summarised as emphasising modernity and industrialism history in opposition to Lewis’s anti-modernity and anti-industrialism. This can be summarised by Dai Smith’s view that the industrial south is the ‘majority experience of Wales’, and the industrial novel tradition of Gwyn Thomas, Jack Jones and Lewis Jones.<sup>628</sup> From this formulation, it has often been easy to view the Welsh-language literature as backward rural and part of a small self-proclaimed Welsh elite (a formulation, except for the pejorative implication, which is not so far from the view of many Welsh-language critics themselves). This has led to the elevation of the ‘realist’ industrial novel against all other viewpoints.<sup>629</sup> In doing so, as Bohata has stated a demarcation takes place that it is only those novels that indicate a particular experience with authenticity (that is, realism) that are worthy of study.<sup>630</sup>

In its own way this is as narrow a view of literature as one that exalts the rural organic community. Indeed, in similar terms to Lewis and traditional English criticism, the role of these particular experiences are in fact seen as part of a general process of modernity – one that is taken as largely neutral, in that it is taken that the spread of English which disavows its own identarian terms. One simply ‘chooses’ to speak English, and any attempt to view the process as a deliberate attack on Welsh is misguided (such a viewpoint seems to ignore structural power in this situation). Moreover, a view of ‘majority Welsh’ as English speaking allows for the view that in

---

<sup>628</sup> D Smith, *Wales: A Question for History* (Seren: 1999), p 35; for an overview see Smith’s analysis of the industrial novels of South Wales, p 163-190

<sup>629</sup> K Bohata, ‘Psycho-colonialism Revisited’ in *New Welsh Review*, Autumn 2005, p 39

<sup>630</sup> *ibid*

class structure it is the Welsh language academics, 'gwerin' and *Eisteddfodwyr* who constitute the bourgeoisie in Wales as against the 'properly' working class South.

The way in which these cultural discursive formations are constructed can be compared with the debates on African literature between Chinua Achebe and Ngugi wa Thiong'o'. Achebe, whose work includes the classic account of colonialism *Things Fall Apart* (its title derived from Yeats), views the use of the English language as necessary because of its advantages derived from the humanistic tradition, but also because it is important to see things 'as they are' in the various national literatures of Africa.<sup>631</sup> In this situation, a national unit accidentally arrived at through colonialism, derives its national literature in the language that unites all – English.<sup>632</sup> Moreover, because of its lingua franca status, English must be transformed by its use in places outside its motherland.<sup>633</sup> In this situation Achebe sees English as the language of the 'national literature' of his own country, Nigeria, and the literatures of the smaller indigenous languages as 'ethnic literatures'. While he does not take this role for English as given and necessary as such, 'as things are' this position must be accepted, and the role of the 'ethnic literatures' is to feed into the national literatures.<sup>634</sup>

Ngugi wa Thiong'o questions this attitude. For Thiong'o, colonialism was not merely constructed by physical force, but also through the imposition of one culture upon another. In this, language is the medium of cultural values, the repository of cultural memory.<sup>635</sup> In Thiong'o's Kenya, the educational system made the passing of the English examination compulsory for a pass, no matter what the result of other subjects.<sup>636</sup> English was thus imposed as the language of achievement.<sup>637</sup> In such a situation, he finds the role of writers who work in this language as being completely unable to provide a truly 'national' literature, as it is the language of a comprador educated class, and the use of language means that 'if it had been left entirely to this

---

<sup>631</sup> C Achebe, *The African Writer and the English Language* in P Williams & L Chrisman, *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (Pearson: 1993), p 430; C Achebe, *Things Fall Apart* (Penguin Classics: 2001)

<sup>632</sup> *ibid*

<sup>633</sup> *ibid*, p 433

<sup>634</sup> *ibid*, p 429, 431

<sup>635</sup> N wa Thiong'o, *The Language of African Literature*, in P Williams & L Chrisman, p 436

<sup>636</sup> *ibid*, p 439

<sup>637</sup> *ibid*

class, African languages would have ceased to exist – with independence!’.<sup>638</sup> He dismisses the idea used in Achebe and his ilk as becoming ‘so obsessed by taking from his mother-tongue to enrich other languages’ to the detriment of their own, and sees the role of minority languages as subversive, democratic and anti imperialist.<sup>639</sup>

Thiong’o thus sees this work in English as ‘hybrid’ (without the positive connotation of Bhabha) – as ‘Afro-European literature’, and this ‘minority’ literature needs demarcation from that of the ‘majority’ African literature in vernacular languages.<sup>640</sup> It is in this spirit that he (along with his colleagues) called for ‘The Abolition of the English Department’ in 1973, seeing the role of canonical (European) works as only being used sparingly and in proper relation to folk works and indigenous works.<sup>641</sup> Thiong’o himself now writes in his native Gikuyu, but it must be noted that his international reputation rests on his earlier English works – the question of translation thus becomes a vexing one, and one that undermines the sort of cultural authenticity which he sees in the position of the native (or ‘ethnic’) languages.

One sees then that these writers point to the tensions implicit in the different positions – one as a search for particular authenticity and cultural memory to a more immediate (universal, humanist) truth, the other as bringing the medium of modernity and universality within the particular (seen decisively – at least in practice – as ‘English’). One cannot of course quite characterise these positions as identical with those of Wales. Firstly, one cannot claim a similar level of enforcement of linguistic homogeneity of colonialism, although it is certainly true that English has historically been the language of achievement. Secondly, the medium of expression – English – is clearly that of the strange composite nationality of the British Isles, and so carries a clearer sense of difference from the minority language (what Achebe would call ‘ethnic literature’). Thirdly, unlike Thiong’o’s appeal to a majority it is clear that Welsh language literature remains the minority within Wales, and indeed this has allowed for the self-identification of historians of South Wales industrialism as

---

<sup>638</sup> *ibid*, p 447

<sup>639</sup> *ibid*, p 435, 450-2,

<sup>640</sup> *ibid*, p 447

<sup>641</sup> N wa Thiong’o, ‘On the Abolition of the English Department’ in B Ashcroft, G Griffiths and H Tiffin (eds) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (Routledge: 1995), 438-42

democratic, revolutionary and majoritarian and so the proper voice of Wales (implicitly and purportedly against rural elitism and bourgeois values).

Nevertheless, one ends up with a similar stalemate – a polarising of positions, around ideas of particular community and tradition, against that of universal aesthetic standard and internationalism. How does one get past this quagmire? It is useful to note the point made by Laclau and used by such critics as Judith Butler and Žižek that in discursive formations *both* the particular and universal are constructed.<sup>642</sup> This view allows us to avoid the teleological viewpoint of international progressivism as ‘more open’ due to its lack of identity and its inclusiveness in its embrace of all identities within the general view of humanism. However this universalism is always more exclusive in whom it speaks for (e.g. regional, national, European, Anglo-American) than its’ silence implies. It is always important therefore to look at the particular articulations of universalism as well as the universal claims of particularism, and the tensions therein. Spaces and places are thus important in being geo-graphed – this is not simply a movement from essentialism to anti-essentialism.

These tensions can be seen in the split nature of all identity – a study of literature thus becomes a means of charting tensions, problematics contradictions, overlapping identifications beyond simply positing someone into a particular identity or measuring works and artist against a properly authentic identification. This postcolonial point also allows for the sympathetic understanding of difficult decisions of artists (amongst others) with ideas of authenticity. There have been different ways of doing this. Stephen Knight in placing a development of nationality in Welsh writing in English as ‘Cymreig’ (‘Welsh’ as in identity) but still, I would argue, developed along the tradition of Saunders Lewis and the Anglo-Welsh and of hierarchies of Welshness within a national narrative.<sup>643</sup> Kirsti Bohata is more interested in the ways stereotypes are produced and mutually constitutive, and her work is characterised by dispersal and relations across cultural spaces. M Wynn Thomas similarly looks at the relations between Welsh language and English language writing in Wales (rather than separating them) seeing their concerns and – particularly – their targets as often the

---

<sup>642</sup> J Butler, E Laclau, S Žižek *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000)

<sup>643</sup> S Knight, *A Hundred Years of Fiction* (University of Wales Press: 2004); see discussion in Introductory chapter

same.<sup>644</sup> Both the latter, however, question received notions of simple identities of Welshness/Englishness.

Terry Eagleton here notes the importance to cultural battles of noting such possibilities in the dominant culture.<sup>645</sup> Lewis was able to make a resistant construction of Welsh literary tradition with similar conceptual tools, albeit also with similar elitist class assumptions. The different effects of intracultural transmission are illustrated in the different strategic positions and tensions that were unveiled in the different contexts of English and particular Welsh literary criticism analysed here. The same could of course be said of different Welsh criticism to Lewis, but here we have indicated the fluidity of the discourse of Literature as a carrier of moral value, and its effects from such particular positions of dominance and marginality in English Literature and Lewis's particular view of tradition.

The attempts to move toward postcolonial theories have been an attempt to deconstruct such assumed views of authenticity, and it is to be hoped that in the post-devolutionary era (which I do not wish to equate unproblematically with 'postcolonial') that it is possible to move away from what Pikoulis sees in Anglo-Welsh formulations as a 'defensive paranoia', without moving to its obverse an 'offensive triumphalism'.<sup>646</sup> It is important to retain the idea of the link between constructions of both the particular and universal in order to not simply be able to view a position as 'modernist', which presumes that such concepts, and identities, are constructed as universal when they are the products of a particular position. It is for this reason that Foucault states the necessity to avoid the blackmail of being for or against the 'Enlightenment' – to assume such concepts to have a particular substance to be for or against is to presume an identity that is not *there*. For Foucault, the point is to use such techniques in an ethic of critique. The same problematic of viewing both 'Welsh culture' and 'Anglo-American culture' – of the particular and the universal is also found in modern Welsh popular music, which indicates the tensions of asserting authenticity – and also the spur it gives to reinvigorating cultural tradition - where culture has been politicised around language.

---

<sup>644</sup> M Wynn Thomas, *Corresponding Cultures*, p 49-51

<sup>645</sup> T Eagleton, *Figures of Dissent* (Verso: 2003), p 51

<sup>646</sup> J Pikoulis, 'The Ideology of 'Anglo-Welsh'', in *Planet 74* (April 1989), p 48

This chapter has indicated the claims of authenticity in tradition in English Literature and Saunders Lewis's literary criticism, and the tensions raised in the construction of Anglo-Welsh criticism in a similar view of tradition. It may be useful to look at these issues to end the chapter through the opposite of what has often been viewed as high culture. This final section looks at the tensions of asserting authority and authenticity, with particular reference to language and nationality, in Welsh popular culture. Yet as Hugh Barker and Yuval Taylor have indicated, authenticity and inauthenticity have played an important part in constructing genres and canons of popular music:

When we listen to popular music, some songs strike us as “real” and others as “fake”. This book explores that distinction, and how, especially in the last fifty years, the quest for authenticity, for the “real,” has become a dominant factor in musical taste. Whether it be the folklorist's search for forgotten bluesmen, the rock critic's elevation of raw power over sophistication, or the importance of bullet wounds to the careers of hip-hop artists, the aesthetic of ‘authentic musical experience’...has played a major role in forming music tastes and canons, with wide-ranging consequences.<sup>647</sup>

In the book, Barker and Taylor outline how genres arise by opposing themselves to other forms of authenticity – for example Kraftwerk and disco, for all their disparities otherwise, revelled in their electronic inauthenticity against the conservatism of rock music.<sup>648</sup> In this section I shall look at how authenticity forms common sense in the role of popular music since the advent of rock and roll in Wales, and the cultural works that have arisen from them.

In Wales, pop and rock music have also challenged the elitist account of artistry and literature in Welsh culture. In using folk music in different spaces, it necessarily also challenged the Eisteddfod's model of Welsh folk culture.<sup>649</sup> The themes of authenticity and organic community, linked to the Welsh language, were important spurs to the development of Welsh popular music. Here, ‘tradition’ could only be

---

<sup>647</sup> H Barker and Y Taylor, *Faking It: the Quest for Authenticity in Popular Music* (Faber & Faber: 2007), p ix

<sup>648</sup> *ibid*, p 229-262

<sup>649</sup> The National Eisteddfod is an annual cultural festival encompassing an array of folk arts. Its separate youth site, Maes B is a host to pop gigs.



invoked with contradictory ideas of authenticity constructed around ideas of ‘authentic’ musical aesthetics, in fact imported with folk music and the symbol of the acoustic guitar. Such ideas of authenticity were always problematised by the synergy and translation of musical styles (from protest folk to punk to reggae and more recently hip-hop) from elsewhere, which’s incorporation in fact accounts for the vibrancy of Welsh-language popular music.

What counted as proper music was linked to politics, as the developments of the Welsh-language infrastructure were self-consciously political, with the civil disobedience of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith* (*Welsh Language Society*) being vital for constructing a structure of gigs for Welsh-language artists, and the record label *Sain* being set-up in order to promote Welsh music.<sup>650</sup> This situation often led to censorship of artists who did not fit the political views of these groups, and to an implicit idea of what authentic music’s message should be. The question of bilingual music was controversial, given that the aim was to promote Welsh-language music which could sustain itself against the onslaught of English language cultural imports.

The tension in this synergy between local and global can be seen in the contrasting figures of Dafydd Iwan staging of ‘authentic’ cultural politics, and another Welsh speaking musician, John Cale, who was at the same time a doyen of New York punk art-rock, which he helped create with Lou Reed in the band Velvet Underground. As Hefin Wyn notes, one was to have a radical effect on Welsh-language culture, the other on Anglo-American culture.<sup>651</sup> It is in the dialectic between the universal and the particular that one must see the contours and vectors of Welsh pop culture.

Dafydd Iwan and John Cale were products of the same locality, the first spending his early years in Brynaman, the latter from the nearby village of Garnant. Dafydd Iwan was to bring popular protest in the style of Woody Guthrie (who’s folk standard *This Land is our Land* he would translate into Welsh), Joan Baez and the early Bob Dylan into Welsh, and set up Wales’s first record label, *Sain*. John Cale was to bring his avant-garde classical sensibilities to influence the New York proto-punk transgressive art-rock of the Velvet Underground under the auspices of Andy Warhol and in

---

<sup>650</sup> H Wyn *Be-Bop-a-Lula'r Delyn Aur* (Lolfa: 2002), p 75-8

<sup>651</sup> *ibid*, p 71-2

collaboration with (mainly) Lou Reed. The Velvet's first album is frequently cited in critics' lists of best albums, and also most influential albums – the phrase repeated *ad nauseam* to illustrate its punk credentials being that it is the album that 'nobody bought, but everyone who did started a band'.<sup>652</sup> Cale would also produce such art-rock/punk luminaries as the Stooges and Patti Smith.<sup>653</sup> Cale would stand aloof from the Welsh music scene until the early nineties (although he often played in Wales) when he championed Gorky's Zygotic Mynki's arty, eccentric mish-mash of ancient folk instruments, punky noise and choirboy vocal, but has been a standard reference point ever since, collaborating with Welsh artists in Marc Evans's film *Beautiful Mistake*.<sup>654</sup>

This section is not then an exhaustive account of the development of Welsh popular culture. Rather, it takes particular works which I take to be particularly suggestive of viewpoints of Welshness and the play between the authentic and inauthentic, the local and the global – the two poles between John Cale and Dafydd Iwan. It also analyses how these works drew on influences as a challenge and subversion to Welsh tradition, in the act of renewing it. As in the role of postcolonial analyses in 'Anglo-Welsh' Literature (or as it is no better known, 'Welsh Writing in English'), the signifier of language as authoritative and authentic is challenged in the nineties. In Welsh popular culture the movement from authenticity and language to the play and subversion of the Super Furry Animals leads to the quintessentially postcolonial moment in Welsh pop of the release of their Welsh language album, *Mwng*. In doing so, it indicates how a position of being inbetween is vital for producing culture, rather than a position of truth and authoritative identity within a tradition as such.

### **John Cale: Exile and Return**

It is interesting in our context to note the importance of Dylan Thomas to John Cale before and after his exile to Anglo-American culture. While it is obviously too simplistic to view Dylan Thomas as a primary influence on his movement from Wales

---

<sup>652</sup> Dai Griffiths, 'Home is living like a man on the run': John Cale's Welsh Atlantic in *Welsh Music History* (4) 2000, p 179n 6

<sup>653</sup> The Stooges, *The Stooges* (Elektra: 1969), Patti Smith, *Horses* (Elektra: 1975)

<sup>654</sup> M Evans, *Beautiful Mistake* (Merlin films: 2000)

- his progression from the National Youth Orchestra to music at Goldsmith's Teaching College, London to New York, via a Leonard Bernstein scholarship is clearly more important – it is fairly clear that he counts as amongst his formative influences.<sup>655</sup> Cale notes that it was Thomas 'who got me going writing poems'.<sup>656</sup> It is also clear that the phrase 'Anglo-American culture' is altogether too vague, at least in the sense of pop music (which is what is usually meant by the phrase in these terms) in describing Cale's position and eclecticism, given his early interest in Dadaism as well as the avant-garde work of John Cage and postmodern composers from an early age. While he writes of enjoying Elvis in his bedroom, in London he claims to being completely unaware of the Rolling Stones – 'I never thought of playing rock music'.<sup>657</sup>

Exiled in New York in the early sixties, Cale regarded himself as European, not Welsh.<sup>658</sup> Many parts of the early years described in his autobiography read like Caradoc Evans' acerbic parody of Welsh nonconformity *My People*, filled with sexual transgression and perversion, in chastity (although this is not judged by Cale), hardship and exploitation, and occasional violence.<sup>659</sup> Elsewhere, however he repeatedly refers positively to the 'close-knit community'.<sup>660</sup> Nevertheless it is also viewed with reverence to education, both in the figure of his mother as a schoolteacher who he claims had pioneered a style of teaching other than by rote.<sup>661</sup> He appreciates the miner's libraries and access to socialist literature.<sup>662</sup> By the end of the book he is closer to using more uncritical and nostalgic viewpoints, and the final paragraph of the book entails a return to Wales, which he describes in extremely romanticised, if not sentimentalised terms (at complete odds with the reflections on childhood):

Embraced once again by the warmth of the hills, the setting sun that shines on the church spire flicks the tips of the gravestones, and the warmth of the people, I felt a sense of wonder. Going home always gives me another lease on life; I am still fascinated by the emotional curve of my journey from Wales to

---

<sup>655</sup> John Cale & V Bockris, *What's Welsh for Zen?* (Bloomsbury: 1999)

<sup>656</sup> *ibid*, p 23

<sup>657</sup> *ibid*, p 39

<sup>658</sup> John Cale & V Bockris, p 52

<sup>659</sup> *ibid*, p 6-33

<sup>660</sup> *ibid*, p 222

<sup>661</sup> *ibid*, p 12

<sup>662</sup> *ibid*, p 27

New York and back again. When I return to Amman Valley it is as if to the bosom of a friend. That friend floats in the language and seduces me with each translation.<sup>663</sup>

The terms of the journey appear to be dramatic enough to travel from the tone of Caradoc Evans to D J Williams in just over 250 illustrated pages! Of course, one should be slightly sceptical of the narrative arc of autobiography, but nevertheless this is clearly a notion Cale felt important enough to use as a central plank, and there are small references to Welsh traditions throughout ('like a Russian National Eisteddfod', 'Gorsedd' etc).<sup>664</sup>

Perhaps, the question is why did Cale reacquaint himself with the Welsh scene in the nineties. Is it merely a question of a personal psychology as that which Nicky Wire of the Manic Street Preachers explains: 'When you're young you just wanna run away from where you were born, and when you're older you want to understand what made you feel like that'.<sup>665</sup> There are no such easy answers here for Cale - the title of his book is itself a reference to this impossibility of fulfilment and translation of complete cultural meaning: *What's Welsh for Zen?* It is perhaps useful to note what this 'journey' means therefore in coordinates rather different from those of geographical position – rather it is precisely what was different in Wales in the nineties which Cale did not find interesting earlier, even with his sense of sentimentality for his home locale in Wales. For this we must look for a view of authenticity in Welsh popular music, and its link to politics.

### **Pop, Protest and Authenticity**

In contrast to John Cale's question 'What's Welsh for Zen?', Dafydd Iwan's famous question and song title – 'Why is snow white?' ('Pam fod Eira'n Wyn?') – uses the question to indicate self-evident knowledge. The question is used to ridicule those who question his politics, as he claims to know what 'freedom' and 'life' is, so that those who question his nationalist beliefs are asking a silly question of the obvious: 'only fools ask why snow is white'. His authenticity is based on certainty. Cale's

---

<sup>663</sup> *ibid*, p 269

<sup>664</sup> *ibid*, p 28, 222

<sup>665</sup> S Price, *Everything (a Book about Manic Street Preachers)*(Virgin Books: 1999) , p 27

question is a far less self-evident difficulty of lack of meaning and coordinates for translatability of the universal with the particular.

Modern Welsh-language pop arrived with the advent of nationalist mass protests in the 1960s, with Iwan taking a prominent part. It was the protest marches which gave spaces outside the respectable 'Noson Lawen' for performance, and these often elevating the protest to a level of carnival and fun.<sup>666</sup> Dafydd Iwan and popular groups such as the surreal and hyperactive *Y Tebot Piws* ('The Puce Teapot') were regular contributors to this atmosphere. This undoubtedly added to the carnivalesque atmosphere described by Dafydd Iwan:

Er mor ddwys a ddifrifol oed y sefyllfa, ac er mor gynhyrfus y teimlem, roedd hwyl yn y gwmniaeth bob amser. Fedra' i ddim pwysleisio gormod ar hyn oherwydd roedd yn nodwedd o holl gwmniaeth ac ymgyrchoedd Cymdeithas yr Iaith yn ystod y blynyddoedd hynny. Credem i gyd yn ddwfn yn yr achos yr ymladdem drosto. Ond doedd hynny byth yn trechu'r hwyl a'r asbri naturiol oedd yn rhan ohonom...Oni bai am hynny, mae'n debyg byddai wedi bod yn llawer iawn anos dioddef yr amgylchiadau.<sup>667</sup>

[Despite the gravity and seriousness of the situation, and despite the excitement we felt, there was always fun in the companionship. I cannot stress this enough as this was the characteristic of the Welsh Language Society campaigns during those years. We all believed deeply in the cause we were fighting for. But this did not defeat the natural fun and vivacity that was part of us...Except for that, it is likely that it would have been far harder to endure the situation.]

As well as providing such public spaces, Cymdeithas yr Iaith also provided a structure of concerts. Gwilym Tudur has described the importance of Cymdeithas yr Iaith to the Welsh-language music scene thus:

Y Gymdeithas hefyd yn anad neb (ond cwmni Sain efallai) a hybodd adloniant miwsig Cymraeg i'r ifanc. Wedi'r Tafodau Tan yng Nghorwen y flwyddyn hon [1973], un o'r nosweithiau mawr hen-ffasiwn, daeth llw o grwpiau roc i gynnal fflam diwylliant newydd poblogaidd, a diedifar Gymreig, y bu'r mudiad iaith yn ffwrnais iddo.<sup>668</sup>

[The Society more than anyone (except for Sain records possibly) promoted Welsh musical entertainment for young people. After Tafodau Tan [Tongues of Fire concert] in Corwen that year [1973], one of the large old-fashioned

---

<sup>666</sup> 'Noson Lawen' were respectable chapel-based variety shows.

<sup>667</sup> D Iwan (ed Manon Rhys), *Dafydd Iwan* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1981), p 82

<sup>668</sup> G Tudur, *Wyt ti'n Cofio?* (Lolfa: 1989), p 107

...nights out, an army of rock groups arrived to carry on the flame of popular, unashamedly Welsh, culture that the language movement had been a furnace for.]

This movement also contrasted itself with the previous popular music of the ‘Noson Lawen’ by dismissing its respectability, and by moving away from the sacred space of the chapel to an altogether more profane one – the pub. As Dafydd Iwan again noted:

Roedd y 60au’n gyfnod o ymryddhau nid yn unig oddi wrth ormes seisnigrwydd a Phrydeindod, ond hefyd i raddau helaeth oddi wrth ormes gwaethaf Anghyddfurfiaeth a Phiwritaniaeth. Roedd mynd i dafarn ynddo’i hun yn herio’r drefn roedd y rhan fwyaf ohonym wedi cael ein magu ynddi, lle roedd y dafarn a’r diod yn bechod anfaddeuol.<sup>669</sup>

[The 60s was a period of emancipation not only from the oppression of Englishness and Britishness, but also to a very large extent from the worst oppressions of Nonconformism and Puritanism. Going to the pub was in itself a challenge to the order that most of us had been brought up in, where the public house and drink were unforgivable sins.]

Therefore, the movement also identified itself in opposition the strictures of nonconformist Wales. A historical tradition was constructed for this revelry that asserted a priority over the Methodist awakening in Wales, whereby this rowdiness was in fact a return to the properly Celtic way of life before the imposition of Nonconformity.<sup>670</sup> It was also a challenge to contemporary Welsh (with a capital ‘w’) cultural norms. The creation of the youth site ‘Maes B’ (‘Site B’) in the Eisteddfod in 1967 was highly controversial, and seen by elders as a den of sin for corrupting youth – Wales’s own alcohol-fuelled summer of love.<sup>671</sup>

It was the inspiration of Saunders Lewis’s radio speech, ‘The Fate of the Language’ where he saw the language struggle as taking precedent against that of self-government, due to the dire reports of the falling numbers of Welsh speakers in the 1961 census.<sup>672</sup> The rallying to use youth culture to construct a specifically welsh speaking sphere can therefore be directly linked to this. Echoing Lewis, Dafydd Iwan viewed things in this way in his diary in 1963: ‘It is not through self-government that this is to be done – that is a wholly separate battle, and it cannot be won in time to

---

<sup>669</sup> D Iwan, M Rhys, *Dafydd Iwan*, p 52

<sup>670</sup> H Wyn, *Be-Bop-a-Lula’r Delyn Aur*, p 76

<sup>671</sup> *ibid*, p 75-8

<sup>672</sup> S Lewis, ‘The Fate of the Language’, in *Presenting Saunders Lewis*

save our culture' ('Nid trwy hunanlywodraeth mae gwneud hyn – mae honno'n frwydr gwbl arwahan, ac ni ellir ei hennill mewn digon o bryd i achub ein diwylliant').<sup>673</sup> It is the cultural battle for the spirit of the nation, associated with the Welsh language that is important.

This message was to have an influence on much of the Welsh music of the period, and also slowly on its aesthetic. The starkest version is Edward H Dafis, and their concept album *Sneb yn Becso Dam* ('Nobody gives a Damn') which follows the farm girl Lisa Pant Ddu who leaves her homestead (Pant Ddu Farm) for the city and falls into deprivation, prostitution and drugs, before returning home (presumably to be 'restored').<sup>674</sup> This gives a fair indication of the viewpoint of urbanity that this political view endorsed.

While the message was conservative, Edward H Dafis' style borrowed heavily upon the earthy rock style of English rock groups such as Status Quo and Slade, which allowed them to escape the fetters of the folk tradition.<sup>675</sup> Pwyll ap Sion has analysed the way in which there appears a discrepancy between the message and the aesthetic, and pointed to its appropriation of cultural exchange as interesting in relation to the message.<sup>676</sup> Nevertheless, he points to the way in which the styles that accompany the individual songs indicate the return to authenticity also for the band:

folk-acoustic to convey traditional values, regret, and finally absolution, while electric-rock elements symbolize haste and irrationality, emigration to the city, drugs, prostitution and alcoholism... One can conclude that through their appropriation of rock musical styles, Edward H Dafis were 'harnessing...American elements' ultimately in order to reject them, and to replace them with the old Welsh, traditional order.<sup>677</sup>

This is an astute commentary on the album, but seems to take the symbolism of acoustic playing as 'authentic' against the American elements of 'electric', forgetting the influence of Woody Guthrie and Bob Dylan on Dafydd Iwan in singing protest songs, and with it the importation of the symbolism of the acoustic guitar as

---

<sup>673</sup> *ibid*, p 71

<sup>674</sup> Edward H Dafis, *Sneb yn Becso Dam* (Sain: 1976)

<sup>675</sup> P ap Sion, Pwyll ap Sion, "'Yn y Fro": Mudiad Adfer and Welsh Popular Song during the 1970s' in *Welsh Music History*, 5 (2002), p 202

<sup>676</sup> *ibid*

<sup>677</sup> *ibid*, p 206

authenticity on Welsh music was forgotten.<sup>678</sup> Whatever the construction of authentic ‘folk-acoustic’, the harnessing of disparate elements to a message of conservation indicates a challenge to Welsh tradition as well as its survival.<sup>679</sup>

In order to understand how a view of stable communal authenticity is misconstrued, it is useful to look at a song by Meic Stevens, the singer-songwriter from Solva in Pembrokeshire, who had travelled through the jazz, blues and folk circles of Cardiff and London. *Yr Incredibyl Seicydelic Siliseibyn Trip i Crymych* (‘The Incredible Psychedelic Siliseibyn Trip to Crymych’) is a wry comedic look back at hippydom, but one that places that scene in the particular context of Crymych, Pembrokeshire.<sup>680</sup> Stevens notes in his autobiography how hippy friends wished to go to pure spaces such as those in Pembrokeshire as a return to an idyll (an odd mirror image to the Welsh nationalist idyll of Adfer).<sup>681</sup> It is also thus a subversive and displacing take on the ‘Fro Gymraeg’<sup>682</sup> – which is heightened because the phrase is the refrain of the chorus. The use of bilingualism is also worth pointing out, as it denies the voice of the narrator a linguistic authenticity and we are never sure from whose perspective the phrases are to be taken (in the following translation, those in English in original or untranslatable from the Welsh are in italics):

In our locale, there’s no smoke or haze,  
And the good people say ‘*wes wes*’  
But *down below* they say ‘*Gadeeks*’!  
And the place is full of *English Freaks*,  
Yeah, in the *Fro*, the *Fro Gymraeg*.  
Nobody’s seen them work a lot,  
They sell *antiques*, grow pot,  
Dress up like Frenni boys,  
In Green wellies on a Butter Mountain,  
Down in the *Fro Gymraeg*.  
I don’t say it can happen too often,  
To disturb the peace of Crymych locals

---

<sup>678</sup> D Iwan, *Can i Gymru* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 2002), p 21-2

<sup>679</sup> Indeed much of the Welsh pop of the seventies was aligned to the Adfer movement who called for the Welsh-speaking ‘exiles’ to ‘recolonize’ the Welsh heartlands. On Adfer, see E Llywelyn ‘What is Adfer?’ in I Hume and W T R Pryce *The Welsh and their Country* (Gomer: 1986), p 244-52; On Adfer and popular music see Pwyll ap Sion, “‘Yn y Fro’: Mudiad Adfer and Welsh Popular Song during the 1970s’

<sup>680</sup> Meic Stevens and L Enenezer, *I Adrodd yr Hanes: 51 o ganeuon Meic Stevens* (Gwas Carreg Gwalch: 1993)

<sup>681</sup> M Stevens, *Hunangofiant y Brawd Houdini* (Lolfa: 2003), p 208

<sup>682</sup> ‘Y Fro Gymraeg’ refers to the Welsh-language heartlands, but also carries strong connotation of ‘home’



The rich of the town look down on  
Those who buy old crocks and caravans  
Down in the *Fro*, the *Fro Gymraeg*,

We haven't seen them eat a lot,  
The odd potato and the old shallot,  
They work on soup without meat,  
Peace to the sheep and pigs in the yard,  
In the *Fro*, the *Fro Gymraeg*.  
They know everything about *astrology*,  
Eastern religion, *anarchy*,  
The poor old Blue so thick and foolish,  
Chase after them everywhere,  
*Operation Julie* is *too much*,  
*Acid, kitchen, speed* – so silly,  
A sin for us who pay our taxes,  
To hunt down such deadbeats,  
Down in the *Fro Gymraeg*.

They had a *festival* in the summer,  
Rock 'n' roll in the lovely weather,  
Carousing, smoking, tanking up,  
Dancing naked every afternoon,  
In the *Fro*, dancing in the *Fro Gymraeg*  
But don't get annoyed, don't get too hot,  
Dancing naked is pure innocence,  
Breasts flashing in the sun,  
Get your body down in the grass,  
Ban this, don't be so foolish,  
Bryn is showing his arse.  
Picking mushrooms in the sun,  
Still picking, *in the dark*,  
But what shocks the local chefs,  
You eat them, you go out your mind,  
*Far out man, you really flip*,  
There's nothing like the Crymych trip,  
In the *Fro*, *Peace* in the *Fro Gymraeg*.

In London House, some hairy boy,  
Enthusiastic member of the Peace Convoy,  
Says he, he had a friend,  
Who got her body down with Bryn,  
And they all laughed,  
When Gwynfor found that he was related,  
To one of the naked hippies at the fair,  
They've called the baby Gwair [Grass], or Mair,  
Yeah, Gwair Mair Cymraeg and so on.

The first verse is clearly the take of the traditional puritans of the 'Fro', and is then laced with stereotyped attacks on the hippies. The final twist is of course that the son

of Gwynfor, one of the puritans (and an implied reference in the name is to Gwynfor Evans as a symbol of the pacifistic traditional moralistic bastion of Welsh political nationalism and nonconformity) finds that he has a granddaughter to one of the hippies, and is a 'daughter of the Grass' (a link to the traditional name for illegitimate children in Wales – 'plant llwyn a pherth' 'children of the grass and bushes'). 'Gwair Mair Cymraeg' indicates the hybrid position of the child.

Stevens' exuberance in singing the song and playing on the words implies he is firmly on the side of the hippies, and it is clear that this is also a site of subversion against the moral codes of the community's elder generation. By displacing the 'Fro Gymraeg' in this way he illustrates that this is not merely the importation of counter-culture from outside, but also the uses of such culture within the community to challenge and use current norms. In effect the song illustrates and celebrates the hybridity of all spaces (including the supposedly static and stable Fro) as places of dynamism, anarchy and contention. In this way, the idea of local cultures as static, holistic and self-contained is seen as ridiculous and funny. The use of the phrase 'peace in the Fro Gymraeg' (The word used for peace - 'tangnefedd' – has religious connotation) illustrates the tensions involved doused in irony. The use of different languages also thus indicates this hybridity. The problematising of such space, and the role of language in such a constructed stability, would become contested in Welsh popular music in the nineties.

### The Politics of Translation and bilingualism in Welsh pop

One of the most successful, and possibly most influential, Welsh bands ever emerged in the early nineties – the Manic Street Preachers, who initially had an uneasy relation to the Welsh language music scene. Their biographer, Simon Price's stereotyped characterisation of this latter scene is interesting here:

Welsh alternative/independent music, such as it was, was under the jealously guarded control of welsh speakers (or 'Gogs', as they were disparagingly known by non-speakers)...The welsh language nearly died out a hundred years ago, until it was artificially revived by a concerted campaign. Although it is admittedly a genuine living tongue in many rural areas, it has also been adopted as something of a middle-class hobby. Among the Cardiff-based

media, fluency in Welsh is the equivalent of a freemason's handshake or an old school tie. If you want to get on, replace those pesky English vowels with Ws and Ys, and start doubling those Ls and Ds. The same was true of the music scene.<sup>683</sup>

Such a description is unfair, and the gross inaccuracies need not be mulled over here (although the idea of a biographer of a campaigning band such as the Manics seeing anything revived by 'concerted campaign' as 'artificial' is somewhat problematic even on its own terms). What is interesting is that it outlines some of the tensions involved in the language issue, and the way in which the characterisations of this non-Welsh speaking Welshman of Welsh-language culture are homogenised and holistic. He sees the real ('genuine living') place of the Welsh language as the rural areas, but posits that of the Cardiff-based media as artificial. From this specific example he denigrates the music scene as a whole as 'jealously guarded...by Welsh speakers'. Price characterises the Manics' position as 'this wasn't about country, it was about class', implying the Welsh culture was always about country, and never about class.<sup>684</sup>

From this position it is easy to characterise the Manics' movement toward accepting 'Welshness' as happening because in 1995 during their enforced absence (due to rhythm guitarist and co-lyricist Richey Edwards' disappearance) 'the better Welsh-speaking bands...suddenly went bilingual and started releasing records in English'.<sup>685</sup> The Manics were then installed as 'adoptive Godfathers of the emergent Taffia'.<sup>686</sup> This unfortunate characterisation thus implicitly depends on the view that all Welsh-language culture is necessarily defensive and inward looking, and it is only when they move on to English-speaking culture that they can adopt the idea of 'cool' paved by the Manics. This reading opens the Manics themselves to accusations of bandwagon jumping, in their adoption of the Welsh flag.

In order to understand this position as different to the two poles of country and class implied by Price it is useful to compare the two bands, Anrhefn and the Manic Street Preachers. Anrhefn's frontman, Rhys Mwyn, who was influenced by punk's politics,

---

<sup>683</sup> S Price, *Everything(a book about the Manic Street Preachers)* (Virgin Books: 1999), p 25

<sup>684</sup> *ibid*, p 22

<sup>685</sup> *ibid*, p 25

<sup>686</sup> *ibid*

attitude and DIY approach, attacked what he saw as an obsession with an elitist version of Welshness:

Does dim modd cael ‘gwell Cymro na’r llall’ neu bod yn ‘fwy Cymraeg’ – does dim hawlfraint ar Gymreictod...Dyma un rheswm am bopeth dwi wedi’i wneud – fy mod eisiau llenwi’r bylchau, ymestyn y ffiniau, ailsgwennu’r gwerslyfr a chreu fersiwn wahanol o Gymreictod...ar ddiwedd y 70au roedd y grwpiau roc Gymraeg, y trefnwyr a’r labeli wedi llwyddo i greu byd bach Cymraeg oedd yn hollol amherthnasol i’r rhan fwyaf o bobl ifanc yng Nghymru. I ni yn Sir Drefaldwyn, mor agos i’r ffin, roedd y byd Cymraeg yn hollol ddiethr er mai Cymraeg oedd ein iaith gyntaf... Mae’r Gymraeg yn perthyn i bawb yng Nghymru, o bob cefndir, o Gasnewydd i Shotton, ac mae gas gennyf gyda chas perffaith y rheini sydd am gadw fersiwn saff a chul o Gymreictod i nhw eu hunain, boed mewn neuadd preswyl ym mhrifysgol Aberystwyth neu yng nghoridorau swyddfeydd y cyfryngau Cymraeg yng Nghaerdydd, a’i droi’n rhywbeth elitaidd gydag uchafbwynt blynyddol yn yr Eisteddfod Genedlaethol yn hytrach na diwylliant a iaith ddeinamig ac amrywiol gyda bwrlwm parhaol trwy’r flwyddyn<sup>687</sup>

[There is no way to get a ‘better Welshman than another’ nor to be ‘more Welsh’ – There is no copyright to Welshness...This is one reason why I do what I do – I wish to fill the spaces, stretch the boundaries, rewrite the textbook and create a different version of Welshness...at the end of the 70s Welsh rock groups, the organisers and the labels had succeeded in creating a little Welsh world that was wholly irrelevant to most young people in Wales. To us in Montgomeryshire, on the border, the Welsh world was completely alien despite the fact that Welsh was our first language...Welsh belongs to everyone in Wales, from every background, from Newport to Shotton, and I despise completely those who would wish for a safe and narrow version of Welshness for themselves, be that in a student hall at Aberystwyth university or in the corridors of the Welsh media’s offices in Cardiff, and turn it into something elitist with the annual highlight of the National Eisteddfod instead of a culture with a dynamic and varied language that bubbles constantly throughout the year.]

This anti-elitist class critique of Welsh culture problematises Simon Price’s characterisation of a unitary Welsh culture, particularly with regards to the underground Welsh scene he cites as ‘strong’ and ‘jealously guarded’. Moreover the movement toward pan-European links were made primarily by Anrhefn, as well as supported by John Peel to the Welsh Underground (in particular the Joy Division-inspired punk nihilism and satires of Datblygu [‘Development’]). As Gruff Rhys of Ffa Coffi Pawb (literally ‘Bean Coffee Everyone’, but when said aloud sounds in Welsh like ‘Fuck off Everyone’) and the Super Furry Animals states:

---

<sup>687</sup> Rhys Mwyn, *Can o’r Tywyllwch: Hunangofiant Rhys Mwyn* (Lolfa: 2006), p 7

Neidiodd Rhys Mwyn mewn fan gigydd a gyrru'n didrugaredd o gwmpas yr Hen Ewrop o ffiniau weiren bigog yn creu rhwydwaith corfforol o gymeriadau o isddiwyllianau gwahanol – pyncs, anarchwyr, rapwyr ac ymgyrchwyr ieithyddol – ugain mlynedd cyn *myspace*.<sup>688</sup>

[Rhys Mwyn jumped into a butcher's van and drove mercilessly around the Old Europe with its wired fence borders creating a physical network of characters from different sub-cultures – punks, anarchists, rappers and language campaigners – twenty years before *myspace*.]

Accusations of inward-looking xenophobia are therefore difficult to sustain. We can see that the position of the Manics and Anrhefn, while clearly marked earlier as polar opposites in relation to the Welsh language, indeed have many overlaps in views. This indicates the way caricatures of holistic classless Welsh culture over-simplify matters. The role of language is articulated with other political concerns. Thus, the disputes over bilingualism in the nineties – that which according to Price served to include the Manics into 'Welshness' – need to be understood beyond their linguistic and identarian matters.

It is true that the Manics' first three albums have little reference to Wales beyond one derisory reference to 'systematised atrocity ignored/ as long as bilingual signs on view' in the anti-PC song PCP.<sup>689</sup> The focus was rather on large abstract themes of alienation, politics and pain. However, this was to change with the release of *A Design for Life*, which while never explicitly linked to South Wales, is clearly a product of that upbringing, and a romantic view of that community.<sup>690</sup> The iconic opening line 'Libraries gave us power' brings to mind the great educational movement in South Wales such as the Plebs' League under Noah Ablett, which produced Labour luminaries such as Nye Bevan and Jim Griffiths as well as prominent Communists, among others.<sup>691</sup> The song clearly also subverts the stereotypes of the Welsh miner into a valoration of the imagery, although one that is more a paean to loss of this memory of a 'design for life' than a celebration, with the words 'I wish I had bottle/Right here in my dirty face/To wear the scars/To show

---

<sup>688</sup> Gruff Rhys, 'Preface' to Rhys Mwyn, *Can o'r Tywyllwch: Hunangofiant Rhys Mwyn* (Lolfa: 2006), p 1

<sup>689</sup> Manic Street Preachers, 'PCP' on *The Holy Bible* (Sony Music Entertainment: 1996)

<sup>690</sup> Manic Street Preachers, 'A Design For Life' on *Everything Must Go* (Sony Music Entertainment: 1996)

<sup>691</sup> *ibid*; G A Williams, *When Was Wales?* (Penguin: 1985), p 244

from where I came'.<sup>692</sup> However the song is also clearly linked to memory and the past which has been wiped out by Thatcher's revolution and is now heritage – 'What price now for a shallow piece of history?'.<sup>693</sup>

In this sense, the link between the Manics and other Welsh acts such as the Super Furry Animals in 1996, with their shared billing in the Cardiff International Arena (and later The Wales Millennium Stadium on 31<sup>st</sup> December 1999) makes sense beyond mere bandwagon jumping.<sup>694</sup> It is ironic, given the Manics' own realist analysis of alienation, that the song seems, like John Cale, to imagine a stable structured Welsh society – a nostalgic 'design', however harshly viewed not so different from the image of stable past organic communities of Saunders Lewis, albeit in the not so distant past and of a radically different class character. Given their excesses in lyrical content to the ills of modern and past society (ranging from anorexia and self harm to White America, sexism and the ironies of radical chic), it is ironic that this view of a past mythic 'home' seems to transcend their subjects of unhomeliness and alienation.

The response of the Super Furry Animals' Gruff Rhys to the language issue has also been contradictory, nuanced, but always in dialogue, even when they broke the Welsh-only rule at the Eisteddfod.<sup>695</sup> This approach rather belies any approach at mere 'tokenism', although until their fourth album *Mwng* their albums were English-dominated. They certainly presented the move to English as done on professional grounds, utilising the point about longevity and necessity, as he pointed out Welsh bands could rarely thrive after a few albums – indeed the loss incurred forced bands into (un)employment. Thus, the argument was done on pragmatic grounds, and could attack criticisms made by professionals using English in their own work as hypocrisy. However, singing songs in English at the Cnapan festival in 1996 caused a furore, and Gruff Rhys responded:

Wel, roedd y set yn y Cnapan yn ddwyieithog, a dwi'n gweld y cyhuddiad a wnaed yn ein herbyn gan bwyllgor yr Wyl yn rhagrithiol gan fod holl llwyddiant eu gwyl yn dibynnu yn rhannol ar ddenu grwpiau uniaith Saesneg

---

<sup>692</sup> Manic Street Preachers, 'A Design For Life'

<sup>693</sup> *ibid*

<sup>694</sup> H Wyn, *Blerwytirhwng?: Hanes Canu Poblogaidd Cymraeg 1980-2000* (Lolfa: 2006), p 354

<sup>695</sup> *ibid*, p 353

megis THE DUBLINERS... Da ni wedi bod yn chwarae ledled Ewrop yr haf yma yn canu caneuon yn Gymraeg i filoedd o bobl sydd heb glywed am ein bodolaeth, ac mae canu caneuon yn Saesneg hefyd wedi ein helpu i gyrraedd y sefyllfa honno. Hefyd dwi'n rhugl iawn yn Saesneg ac yn mwynhau ygrifennu yn yr iaith honno. Mae'n ymddangos ei bod yn iawn i BRYN TERFEL neu rywun fel HUW EDWARDS i ddefnyddio unrhyw iaith y dymunant. A beth am fy arwr JOHN CALE? Mae'r cyfryngau Cymraeg yn meddwl bod yr haul yn sgleinio o'i dwll tin o a be mae o 'di neud dros yr iaith? Ffyc ol heblaw am ganu 'Myfanwy' ar Heno!<sup>696</sup>

[Well, the Cnapan set was bilingual, and I see the accusation made against us by the festival committee to be hypocritical since their success depends in part upon attracting monolingual bands in English such as THE DUBLINERS... We have been playing throughout Europe this summer singing songs in Welsh to thousands of people who don't know of our existence, and singing songs in English has also helped us to reach that situation. Also, I am very fluent in English and enjoy writing in that language. It appears to be fine for [opera singer] BRYN TERFEL or someone like [newscaster] HUW EDWARDS to use any language they like. And what about my hero JOHN CALE? The Welsh media think the sun shines out of his arse and what has he done for the language? Fuck all except singing 'Myfanwy' on [S4C magazine programme] *Heno!*]

Rhys here refuses to be pigeonholed under the language only – pointing out that it is one rule for Welsh rock musicians and another for musicians elsewhere, or in different genres. The opera singer Bryn Terfel, for example, is clearly adored as a product of the Fro Gymraeg and the Eisteddfod, and yet is allowed to (necessarily) sing in different languages.<sup>697</sup> Similarly, Huw Edwards' appointment as main newsreader for the BBC news passes without comment. As one correspondent puts:

Mae'r rhan fwyaf o bawb ohonom yn defnyddio Saesneg yn ein gwaith a llawer yn ennill arian drwy berfformio neu sgrifennu ynddi. Rhagrith ydi beio neb arall am wneud yr un peth.<sup>698</sup>

[Most of us use English in our work and many make money by performing or writing in that language. It is hypocrisy to blame anyone else for doing the same thing.]

However, the article goes on to question the assumptions of internationalism and self-confidence of Gruff Rhys's stance:

<sup>696</sup> *ibid.*, p 352

<sup>697</sup> On Bryn Terfel see Geraint Lewis 'Bryn Terfel' in T Herbert and P Stead (eds) *Hymns and Arias: Great Welsh Voices* (Cardiff: 2001)

<sup>698</sup> cited in H Wyn, *Blerwyttirhwng*, p 359

Os oedd cerddorieth yn ‘iaith ryngwladol’, pam oedd angen troi i unryw iaith ond y Gymraeg? Os ydi pawb bellach yn hyderus yn yr iaith, pam nad ydan ni’n ddigon hyderus i fynd a hi efo ni i’r byd tu allan?<sup>699</sup>

[If music is an ‘international language’, why is it necessary to turn to any language except Welsh? If everyone is so confident with the language, why are we not confident enough to take it with us to the world outside?]

Of course, this also takes a rather simplistic view of the choice made – for many (such as Gorky’s Zygotic Mynai), bilingualism was a normal state of affairs in their daily lives.<sup>700</sup> However, the question of the need to be (mostly) English remained an awkward question, given that the two most popular bands – the Super Furry Animals and Catatonia – released the majority of their singles and album tracks in English, with Welsh playing a peripheral role.

The fear is clearly that this is a zero-sum game, whereby an increase in the use of English damages the Welsh language. The counter arguments are that the use of English allows the transmission and knowledge of the existence of the Welsh language to new audiences, and thus concomitant (self-)respect. This assumes that the market is ‘English’, and that it is necessary to speak the language of the market in order to succeed. The alternative to this would be the ‘world music’ category, which tends often to expect – and promote and construct – ‘traditional(ised)’ styles of music.<sup>701</sup>

**But it is also possible to look at this problem in somewhat different terms, and take the fact of bilingualism as opening a space for play, subversion and commentary upon the two positions. Gorky’s Zygotic Mynai, for examples, juxtapose wildly different music styles, often within a single song, and also switch easily from one language to another, often to baffling effect (given that they have songs with such surreal titles as ‘If Fingers were Xylophones’ this is**

---

<sup>699</sup> *ibid*

<sup>700</sup> *ibid*, 252-3

<sup>701</sup> H Barker and Y Taylor, *Faking It*, p 297-319; The paradigmatic case is that of the hugely successful *Buena Vista Social Club* which was a cultural excavation mission by Ry Cooder to find musicians of the said club; most of the musicians had not played together, had played in a variety of Cuban styles, and the model of authenticity in recording was Cooder’s own. This is not to say that this is somehow ‘fake’, nor that the music is not wonderful; it does however mean that a search for authenticity may lead to stereotyped versions of local cultures, little heard in their own cultures. The dangers of this in World Music arise from Buena Vista’s success, as a possible commercial model to be emulated.



**unsurprising). Nevertheless it is possible to see times of subversion and contrast dependent on the use of two languages.**

In 'Patio Song', released as a single (given single of the week by then-Radio 1 morning DJ Marc Radcliffe) and on their album *Barafundle*, it is difficult not to read their apparently skewed love song differently due to the knowledge of Welsh context and language.<sup>702</sup> The start of the song begins oddly with the words 'Isn't it a lovely day?/ My Patio's on fire', before moving on to an innocent Beach Boys type lyric on romance (albeit with a slightly dissonant guitar chord change which skew the archetypal Righteous Brothers-esque arpeggios).<sup>703</sup> It is difficult not to see this as an oblique reference to the Meibion (Sons of) Glyndwr's campaign of burning summer homes, especially with 'patio' being taken as a signifier for property and wealth.<sup>704</sup> The lyric in Welsh that appears as the middle-eight is also suggestive:

Mae'n bwrw glaw,  
So dal fy llaw,  
A mae'r gaeaf mor hir  
Mae'n cymryd gormod o'r tir.<sup>705</sup>

[It's raining down,  
So hold my hand,  
And the winter's so long,  
It takes too much of the land.]

The contrasting pathetic fallacy between rain and winter in Welsh with summer and a 'lovely day' in English confirms an oblique commentary on this situation, with winter in Welsh also meaning 'taking too much land'. It is difficult when hearing this song not to take these references as striking, despite being placed in a seemingly innocent love song.

The obliqueness of such an approach fits with Gorky's (un)usual blend of surrealism and faux-innocence, traits they share with Super Furry Animals. This surreal edge to their lyrics appears to be a movement away from an open (and self-limiting) political stance. During the seventies and eighties, much commentary expected that Welsh

---

<sup>702</sup> Gorky's Zygotic Mynki, 'Patio Song', on *Barafundle* (Fontana: 1997)

<sup>703</sup> *ibid*

<sup>704</sup> On this campaign see A Gruffydd and L Ebenezer *Mae Rhywun yn Gwybod...* (Gwasg Carreg Gwalch); The reference to Glyndwr is to the fifteenth century Welsh rebellion led by Owain Glyndwr

<sup>705</sup> Gorky's Zygotic Mynki, 'Patio Song'

music should be political in intent (this shared by both Edward H Dafis's Adfer-influences and Anrhefn's punk<sup>706</sup>). The surreal approach challenges this view. By juxtaposing wildly different styles and images, both these bands could escape these constraints, while nobody could accuse them of producing stereotypical love songs. It also illustrates that cultural products and economics are not deterministically linked, but may allow (and create) spaces for subversion, and that moving away from over-dependence on Welsh media institutions and markets allows for more freedom to criticise it.

The other 'supreme postcolonial Welsh pop moment' was the release of the Super Furry Animals' album *Mwng* in 2000, their fourth album.<sup>707</sup> The album was in Welsh due to a backlog of songs the band had accumulated. It has been estimated that the relative cost of *Mwng* was £6,000, compared to its predecessor *Guerilla* at £100,000.<sup>708</sup> It also arrived at the time of their record label, *Creation*'s collapse (although they were due to release it), and so the band released the album on their own label, to universal acclaim from the NME, but also from the Sunday broadsheets. The album, completely in Welsh, charted in the British charts at number 11. Ironically, given received wisdom on the unmarketability of the Welsh-language music, this album may well have been the band's most successful financially up to that point, due to the fact that they released it on their own label.

However, the Super Furry Animals' Welsh-language album would never have received the coverage that it had if they had not already made a name for themselves, which was certainly aided by their decision to sing in English as well. In fact, what we see here is in some ways similar to the debates between Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and Chinua Achebe on whether novelists should write in English or in their mother tongue. As noted earlier, Ngugi wa Thiong'o sees the use of English as complicit with Anglo-American cultural imperialism, and being to the service of a comprador class, indicating the inculcation of English through educational and cultural institutions.<sup>709</sup>

---

<sup>706</sup> on Adfer see Pwyll ap Sion, "'Yn y Fro": Mudiad Adfer and Welsh Popular Song during the 1970s'; on Welsh punk see Rhys Mwyn, *Can o'r Tywyllwch: Hunangofiant Rhys Mwyn* (Lolfa: 2006)

<sup>707</sup> D Griffiths & S Hill, *Postcolonial Music in Contemporary Wales: Hybrids and Weird Geographies* in J Aaron & C Williams (eds) *Postcolonial Wales* (Cardiff: 2005), p 228-9

<sup>708</sup> H Wyn, *Blerwyttirhwng?*, p 356

<sup>709</sup> N wa Thiong'o, 'The Language of African Literature', p 436

As such, he sees the use of vernaculars as necessarily socialist and closer to folk culture, and makes the decision to only publish in his native tongue.<sup>710</sup>

However, the position is much more complex than this of course. The fact that he is able to make this move also revolves around the possibility of translating his work – in this sense, while undoubtedly contributing to his own language, there is also a question as to why his work would be chosen to be translated into English. In other words, would there be a call to translate his work had he not already made his name in international academia by writing in English? Even this position is not altogether ‘pure’ – and nor of course should it be construed or condemned as such. In this sense, then, Super Furry Animals’ decision to release an album in Welsh is not indicative of a ‘return’ to roots, or a need to appease Welsh fans (many of whom would have bought their albums anyway). What it indicated was the way in which the use of the record industry and the international market could allow for a successful album in Welsh, and the use of power and influence accrued in order to make such an impact.

As for the album itself, the low budget meant that its aesthetic was largely acoustic, and certainly pared-down from the band’s wilder techno excesses of their *Guerrilla* album. Ironically, this fits with the usual ‘traditional’ aesthetic of world music (and Adfer) although there was nothing particularly ‘Welsh’ in the orchestration (the album is as playful in musical styles as usual).<sup>711</sup> Its pared down style also showcased their Beach Boys-esque grasp of melody and harmony. Significantly, *Ymaelodi a’r Ymylon* (‘Joining the Periphery’) includes the following lines:

Mae nhw’n deud bod ni ar yr ymylon,  
Yn weision bach ffyddlon,  
Yn arw ac estron,  
Ac mae hi’n llugoer ayn llygad y ffynnon,  
Ond ar yr ymylon,  
Mae’r danadl poethion.<sup>712</sup>

[Well, they say we’re peripheral people  
Spineless and feeble,  
Roughneck and evil,  
And it’s so cool in the eye of the fountain

---

<sup>710</sup> *ibid*, p 451

<sup>711</sup> H Barker & Y Taylor, *Faking It*, p 307

<sup>712</sup> *Mwng* (Placid Casual: 2000), translation from [www.Mwng.co.uk](http://www.Mwng.co.uk)

But the peripheries sustain  
The hottest nettle.]

As Dai Griffiths and Sarah Hill note, the periphery here is doubled – both Wales as periphery of Anglo-American popular culture, and at the periphery of Welsh musical culture.<sup>713</sup> They note that the Super Furry Animals fall neither into exclusively ‘British’ nor exclusively ‘Welsh’ position, but Homi Bhabha’s ‘in-between space’.<sup>714</sup> I concur, but would disagree with the use of ‘Welsh/English’ or ‘Anglo-American/Welsh’ in quite this way, which tends to use Bhabha’s hybrid in terms rather similar to biology – that it is in-between two holistic spaces. It is because of this that Griffiths and Hill are able to point to a continuum from rock authenticity of the Stereophonics to experimentation of the Super Furry Animals, with postcolonialism only useful to analyse the latter.<sup>715</sup> However, it is because terms such as ‘British’, ‘Welsh’, or ‘Anglo-American culture’ are themselves hybrids of sub-cultures and nationalities that they allow for such subversion. In other words, to mimic American culture from a different space is in itself to provide an uncanny difference within it.

The Super Furry Animals’ *Mwng* is important precisely because it is made not in the name of cultural authenticity in its use of the Welsh language, although its use denotes a certain affinity with the peripheries and the marginal. Rather, its creation is due the accretion of power and influence that allowed the album could become a success on their terms. It is therefore important not to view turning to English as ‘turning one’s back’.<sup>716</sup> In contrast to the politicised birth of Welsh modern music done under the influence of Lewis’s radio lecture and the protests of the sixties, it appears that the movement is towards the use of the Welsh language strategically and aesthetically, whereby its use can be articulated with other concerns and not merely as the ‘language issue’. Perhaps one can see this as a movement from Saunders Lewis’ cultural authenticity signified by language, to that of his critic R T Jenkins:

There are those among us who regret in particular the rapid shrinkage in the number of Welsh monoglots, whom they regard as essential to the

---

<sup>713</sup> D Griffiths & S Hill, ‘Postcolonial Music in Contemporary Wales’, p 229

<sup>714</sup> *ibid*

<sup>715</sup> *ibid*, p 230; the use of the presumed ‘authenticity’ of a (say) Bruce Springsteen translated from New Jersey to the Welsh valleys is itself an interesting instance of cultural travel.

<sup>716</sup> H Wyn, *Blerwyttirhwng?*, p 328

preservation of the language – a view which, whether tenable or not in theory, is in practice becoming absolutely irrelevant. Isolation has undoubtedly preserved Welsh in the past. But nowadays, universal teaching of English in the schools, English daily papers on every breakfast table, a steady bombardment of Welsh ears, in the remotest recesses of the country, by English broadcast transmissions, have radically altered the conditions. Most Welshmen would agree that if Welsh cannot be bilingual, it cannot be Welsh-speaking at all.<sup>717</sup>

As Griffiths and Hill put it, this postcolonial moment was ‘to suggest, in effect, the equally weighted importance of local culture and internationally shared popular culture.’<sup>718</sup> In order to grasp at the idea of possible resonance with others elsewhere, it is perhaps as important now to ask ‘Blerwyttirhwng?’ (‘Whereareyoubetween?’) as much as to ‘stand in the gap’. The position may not be to channel and authentic tradition of Welshness, but to play with inauthenticity and place oneself at the interstices between local and global without the need for the authority of a ‘received’ tradition. There are many possible receptions of many traditions.

## **Conclusion**

Saunders Lewis’s vision of a national literature and of a civilised and civilising organic Welsh community reflected in it gave a cultural authority to the literary critic to speak for Wales and its culture by claiming to receive a tradition. This vision of Wales was a mythic view of history constructed against crude materialist forces (be they the English nation-state, capitalism or Marxism), but was also a particular manifestation of contestation to the dominant national narrative of the period, of a peaceable Welsh culture within an Anglo-Celtic Empire. It was a viewpoint that involved a view of a radically politicised Welsh culture. By changing the history and the space of Wales by placing it within a Latin, Catholic and European civilisation prior to the nation-state, Lewis was thus reacting to this narrative with another one of his own that rearticulated the relation between the local and global, particular and universal, away from a junior partner in the global space of the British Empire. This politicised view of Welsh culture elevated the nation and its literature to a quasi-

---

<sup>717</sup> R T Jenkins, ‘The Development of Nationalism in Wales’, in *The Sociological Review* XXVII, vol 2 (1935), p 180-1

<sup>718</sup> Hill and Griffiths, ‘Postcolonial Music in Contemporary Wales’, p 229

religious spiritual level, with moral value in defence against the corruption of modernity. Lewis's work gained authority to 'speak for' Wales with his literary criticism and his elevation of the authentic critic and artist to be a channel for the national tradition and assert a lost essence of Welsh civilisation as a means to combat modernity's pernicious effects.

Prior and parallel developments in the construction indicate the discourse of literature, language and nationality within which Lewis's resistant construction of a European Welsh tradition was made. English Literature was to become a means of instructing moral value and civility, and had displaced Classics and Philology in the process. Lewis adopted a similar view of moral value and applied it to a self-constructed cultural tradition that would be used to attack the materialism of his age. His role as critic and artist channelling this self-made tradition was precisely what gave him authority to speak for Wales; albeit his Wales, the Wales of the 'we' who fit into this tradition of Welsh-speaking civilisation. It was this critical analysis that allowed him to formulate a vision of Wales counter to that of being a partner in Empire, and to construct a Welsh literary history and national narrative that illustrated this. It was this view that shaped his politics and his symbolic view of history that allowed for activism.

The cultural status of Lewis's formulation of nation and literature is seen in the fact that the construction of an Anglo-Welsh discipline had to relate itself to his dismissal of its existence. In order to prove him wrong, similar questions of 'how Welsh is this work' were answered differently to Lewis, but it remained a question which led to a definition of Welsh as dependent on places and biography, from which one could glean a certain Welsh character or essence. In doing so, it assumed many of its assumptions of the artist and tradition, but dismissed language as being inextricably linked to Welsh national culture, with different aesthetic requirements to qualify as 'Welsh'.

Our exploration of Welsh pop music has illustrated different positions of authenticity and their contestation. John Cale and Dafydd Iwan, while products of similar locales, offer polar versions of the questions of authenticity and spaces of identity, with the first revelling in uncertainty, and the other dependent on certainty; the first globalised

in his view of culture, the second localised. It is between these vectors that I have analysed the pop culture works. We have indicated how Welsh cultural work can be conservative in message, but adopt genres from elsewhere in order to sustain that localised message and to subvert the dominant culture 'at home', but also to be open to viewing local spaces as dynamic and contested, already infused in wider discourses. The nineties illustrate a rapprochement between Welsh-language and Welsh popular music in English, as illustrated by the Manic Street Preachers, and Gorky's Zygotic Mynki and the Super Furry Animals indicate how authenticity and styles can be played with, with political and cultural effects. A strategy that plays with authenticity may be able to subvert more effectively in cultural matters than a politics of truth and identity.

Cultural resistance is not so easy as to stay in one language or culture, in whatever national narrative and literary tradition, or to choose to 'turn one's back' on these by adopting the clothes of 'another'. The point is to find dissonances, connections and echoes across and inbetween cultures and aid a culture by subverting the structure of peripherality and centrality. Saunders Lewis, although adopting much of the elitism, stood in this political gap that he forged for himself through his criticism, and there was a view of the Welsh language as a central part of the authenticity of Euro-Welsh civilisation. Such a convergence of moral value and nation, language and authenticity occurred as a spur to constructing Welsh popular music. Indeed, it was a vital part in making that music possible, but it is also possible for such radical movements and development to have a conservatism at heart. It is perhaps for this reason that John Cale, the doyen of avant-garde unmeaning, could be more active in the nineties in Welsh rock, with its identities in flux and its embracing of in-between spaces. The Super Furry Animals show that to play with ideas of authenticity and to embrace the inbetweenness of cultural production may have subversive effects.

The point therefore is to take on board that culture is itself amorphous, and that to beg borrow or steal across cultures (or more correctly, intra-culturally) is not to betray one's own self contained 'culture'. In fact if the two parts of that construct 'Welsh culture' were to become entwined completely, there would in fact be little culture worthy of the name – the spaces constructed in-between a culture for-itself and in-itself are precisely the spaces where such articulations can be made. There can be no

‘end’ to culture, as there can be no end to history or politics. After all, what *is* Welsh for Zen?



## Conclusion

### Where Was Wales When?: The Location of the Welsh Subject and Welsh Culture

In ‘Welshing (on) postcolonialism’, this thesis has been an attempt to place Wales into a postcolonial framework, and to illustrate the uses of postcolonial theory to a study of Welsh identities. In attempting to finally place Wales and the Welsh within the framework of postcolonialism, it is useful to recall Fredric Jameson’s warning about the use of the concept ‘postmodernism’:

Postmodernism is not something we can settle once and for all and then use with a clear conscience. The concept, if there is one, has to come at the end, and not the beginning of our discussions of it. Those are the conditions...that prevent the mischief of premature clarification – under which this term can productively be used.<sup>719</sup>

As Jameson warns against the premature clarification of postmodernism, so I would argue that this is a productive way in which we can use postcolonialism. We cannot therefore ask ‘what is postcolonialism?’, the answer to which can then be used once and for all as this would return us to the problem of first defining macro-level concepts as illustrated in the discussions on ‘colonialism’ in the introduction. I would argue that it is by working on the material that one can productively utilise its concepts of hybridity, ambivalence and power in contesting claims to authenticity and authority. This is what this thesis has attempted to achieve.

In order to tease out what this means in practice, and the contribution of this thesis to the field of postcolonialism and Welsh politics, it is useful to return briefly to the postcolonial debate in Wales. In doing so, it is possible to outline the problematisations that my thesis has brought into the field. In a salutary and ambitious contribution to the book *Postcolonial Wales*, Chris Williams articulates his use of postcolonialism in relation to Wales, and his text indicates some of the tensions and difficulties of such an encounter between the theory and material.<sup>720</sup> Chris Williams’ work is a useful starting point from which to illuminate what the concerns of this

---

<sup>719</sup> F Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Duke University Press: 1992) p xxii

<sup>720</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales: An Exploration in Historiography and Postcoloniality’ in C Williams & J Aaron *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)

thesis are, and more importantly, what they are not, which can help formulate how this thesis goes beyond the current debates on Welsh postcolonialism.

#### Wales, Nationality and Postcolonialism

As seen in the Introduction, the mistaken driving question for Welsh postcolonialism has been ‘was Wales colonised?’ Chris Williams answers this question in the negative. However, he asserts the possibilities of its concepts of hybridity and ambivalence, and this in order to analyse empirical historical events. These he cites as immigration, and the analysis of disparate ethnic groups in Wales, including its largest ethnic group of those born in England, in order to deconstruct the fantasy of a ‘unified, complete, secure and coherent identity’ which he imputes to Welsh nationalism’s stance.<sup>721</sup> He asserts that such nationalism, with its:

reactive and essentialist binarisms erect psychological barriers between peoples, excite unnecessary antagonisms toward others, and render marginal or invisible those whose characteristics do not fit those of the imagined nation.<sup>722</sup>

His aim is to move to a post-national Wales, citing R Merfyn Jones, ‘a place with citizens, not a cause with adherents.’<sup>723</sup> Essentially, he aims for the death of the Welsh Subject as a coherent self-fulfilled identity, and place civil rights and responsibilities decoupled from national identity, which he sees in the hostile terms above.<sup>724</sup>

His fidelity to History-with-a-capital-letter (or what Dai Smith calls, to ‘what occurred’), to be read singularly by the professional historian, constantly undermines his use of postcolonial terms. For Chris Williams, there is a clear separation between the hyphenated ‘post-colonial’ (‘after colonialism’, where colonialism is a real, material and historical entity) and the unhyphenated ‘postcolonial’ (‘disparate forms of “*representations, reading practices and values*” that may circulate “across the

---

<sup>721</sup> *ibid*, p 15

<sup>722</sup> *ibid*, p 16

<sup>723</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales’, p 16; R Merfyn Jones ‘Beyond Identity? The Construction of the Welsh’, *Journal of British Studies*, 31 (1992), p 357

<sup>724</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales’, p 16

barrier between colonial rule and national independence”’).<sup>725</sup> Williams denies the validity of the first of these, while retaining the latter. This is because in Wales there can be no connection to the non-white colonies by moral equivalence – ‘there was no Welsh Amritsar’.<sup>726</sup>

His empirical points on the Amritsar massacre close off an avenue for discussion on the basis of morality, creating its own borders. Clearly there was no ‘Welsh Amritsar’, but there is no need to assert this equivalence to use postcolonial theory to analyse interconnections and parallels. As seen in this thesis, the interconnections of Britain, Wales, and India do not begin and end with the Amritsar massacre. While certainly it would be deeply offensive to make such an equivalence in terms of the violence and coercion suffered this is not where the focus of the postcolonial framework lies – such victimology is complicit, always-already in the colonial discourse, and fails to ask further questions. ‘Amritsar’ is thus used here as shorthand for ‘India’ and Indian history. The Subaltern Studies group of Indian intellectuals, whom Williams refers to in his essay, problematise such totalities, and indeed illustrate the complicated complicity that many Indian nationalists constructed in relation to this.

But Williams’ analysis allows no space for power in his use of notions of hybridity and ambivalence, and so these concepts stand rather precariously as free-floating entities, leading him to the paradoxical viewpoint of an empirical historian embracing the wildest excesses of postmodern theory. It is rather strange to see him embrace Stanley Fish’s view of postcolonial theory as ‘try on this belief; make it, rather than some other assumption, the content of your perception, and see what you see.’ For an empiricist historian this is a wildly postmodern ‘anything goes’ viewpoint I doubt serious postcolonial writers would embrace; certainly not Edward Said, whom he believes takes such a theoretical standpoint.<sup>727</sup>

On the other hand, his empiricist fidelity to the historical event as facts and figures leads him to use these concepts in relation only to what he imputes to real events – hybridity is used to ‘mean the way in which migration, settlement and intermarriage

---

<sup>725</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales’, p 1-2

<sup>726</sup> *ibid*, p 10

<sup>727</sup> *ibid*, p 12

have blurred Welsh frontiers of ethnic identification.’<sup>728</sup> While migration is an important part of much of postcolonial writings, this use of hybridity fundamentally misunderstands the concept, suggesting that it is somehow a biologicistic blurring between discrete entities. Even when such blurring is celebrated, it is a dangerous view, and one which ironically gives to past Welsh identity a fully complete and coherent identity which is only *then* diluted by modern processes – precisely the view that he accuses his nationalist opponents of adhering to.

Analysing these processes as involving a pre-given identity which is *then* hybridised misses the fact that postcolonial theory cannot take any cultural entity as self complete. Its aim is not a view of origins (whether to be celebrated or condemned) which imputes a national self-completeness in the past. As Foucault notes, this search for identity ‘assumes the existence of immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession.’<sup>729</sup> Chris Williams is caught in this insistence on identity even as he rails against it. His focus on empirical events dismisses a possible history of ‘values, morality, asceticism and knowledge.’<sup>730</sup> Identity is always-already hybrid, even when it attempts to show that it is not. It is the emergence and rearticulation of such borders that has been the subject of this thesis.

It is the particular identity chosen by Williams to be attacked as full, coherent and exclusionary that is significant. Williams’ treatment of Welsh-speaking identity indicates precisely the difficulties involved in writing on identity, in positing one upon others as much as assuming one’s own. Williams drifts into the realms of the stereotype as analysed by Bhabha in the introductory chapter, as mastery through knowledge, and a way of constructing and disavowing Williams’s own emplacement. In celebrating the post-national universal as hybrid and free flowing, as well as other minorities in Wales, it is structurally necessary to indicate that Welsh nationalism is a self-contained identity that needs to be ‘hybridised’. He attempts to move above and below ‘Wales’ to construct diffuse identities. His use of facts and figures, illustrating the ethnic group of those born in England as the largest ethnic group in Wales (590,000), indicates a certain view of the majority within Wales which already takes it

---

<sup>728</sup> *ibid*, p 14

<sup>729</sup> M Foucault, ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’ in P Rabinow (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 2: Aesthetics* (Penguin: 1994), p 371

<sup>730</sup> *ibid*, p 375

to be a self-contained nation.<sup>731</sup> And yet he has already asserted the importance of Britishness to Wales – a Welsh nationalist response would surely assert ‘their’ own minority status within Britain. One ends again with discrete and holistic identities of ‘a people/a nation’ in the act of wishing to deconstruct them.

Chris Williams uses the following passage by Raymond Williams to bolster his argument:

It can be said that the Welsh people have been oppressed by the English for some seven centuries. Yet it can be said that the English people have been oppressed by the English state for even longer. In any such general statements all the real complications of history are temporarily overridden.<sup>732</sup>

This statement is not, as Chris Williams uses it, a full stop to any argument, but rather a warning that ‘it won’t help, either side of the border, to mistake the State for the real identity, or the projections of the people.’<sup>733</sup> Chris Williams has already imputed a supposed holistic identity to Welsh (speaking) ‘people’ which does precisely this – given that Wales has historically been a stateless nation this mistake warned against by Raymond Williams is compounded. Ironically this puts Chris Williams in a similar position to J R Jones’s nationalist viewpoint on the position of Welsh speakers. Although he is on the other side of the divide in wishing to deconstruct that identity subsequently through internationalism (or ‘post-nationalism’), the structure of the borders he constructs are similar, and do not hold up to critical analysis or the use of postcolonial concepts of hybridity.<sup>734</sup>

Raymond Williams’ statement allows us to move where analysis needs in relation to Welsh culture in going beyond this opposition of local and particular versus ‘internationalist’ and universal. While Chris Williams closes off discussion by using ‘real historical events’ as a material basis, Raymond Williams indicates the importance of complexity, and cultural responses to it:

complexity can also be seen positively. As earlier, in certain phases of the culture, the painful recognition of real dislocations, discontinuities, problematic identities has led not only to

---

<sup>731</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales’, p 14

<sup>732</sup> C Williams, ‘Problematizing Wales’, p 10; R Williams, ‘Wales and England’ in D G Williams (ed) *Who Speaks for Wales?* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff: 2003) p 16;

<sup>733</sup> R Williams, ‘Wales and England’ p 18

<sup>734</sup> On J R Jones, see chapter 2

division and confusion but to new and higher forms of consciousness. It is true that these are very difficult to disentangle from the available forms of description and statement, as is clear in the latest phase of nationalism. But it is, for example, very significant that one tendency in contemporary Welsh nationalism is, so to say, an anti-nationalist nationalism. This has important cultural precedents, in suspicion of any centralized state. But it is also a correct and far-reaching response to certain dominating contemporary political and economic developments, which are outdistancing all earlier forms.<sup>735</sup>

This statement illustrates Raymond Williams's value for postcolonialism, indicating the complications of identification in relation to mobility and fluidity. His phrase 'anti-nationalist nationalism' indicates precisely the problem of Chris Williams's analysis of Welsh nationalism as necessarily conservative and inward-looking, and hostile to others. Welsh identity, however formulated and with all its own border making, cannot be analysed as a pure particularity and holism, and simply attacked as such. It must be analysed in relation to its articulations with other processes and discontinuities, in order to understand the emergence of its own particular worldviews at particular times. These complex articulations have been the subject of this thesis.

This returns us to the central question of 'Was Wales colonial?/is Wales postcolonial?' As with other writers, Chris Williams is drawn to answer this question, and does so in the negative. However, Raymond Williams's above quotation again gives us an indication of how to approach this in stating that general statements tend to override the complications of history. To sever theory from practice in positing theoretical concepts to be used outside material reality (posited here as 'colonialism') as Chris Williams does is an illegitimate move. This is a split between ideal theory and material reality which, as I remarked in my introductory chapter of Kirsti Bohata's treatment of the problem by a split between the literary and the historical, is unsustainable. It is for this reason that Chris Williams is forced into the bizarre reconciliation between his empirical view of historical events with the position of trying on a theory as a piece of clothing. It is useful to see his evidence that Wales was not colonised in his treatment of the 1847 Blue Books, as analysed in the first chapter of this thesis:

Not even the 1847 reports of the education commissioners...make much of a dent in this essentially beneficial picture, for the reaction they provoked helped to assert and defend Welsh nationality and culture, and the extreme positions the commissioners took up (which need to be viewed in the context of mid-Victorian reforming efforts aimed at the working class, Welsh or not) were not followed through in the action of the British state.<sup>736</sup>

---

<sup>735</sup> R Williams, 'Wales and England', p 24

<sup>736</sup> C Williams, 'Problematizing Wales', p 5-6

Here, one sees the fact that the Blue Books provoked a reaction as proof that they did not involve a colonial policy. However, that an action was not ‘successful’ does not in itself disqualify it as a colonial policy or mentality. The Indian Mutiny was unsuccessful in attaining Indian freedom, but this is not the end of the story. The Mutiny signalled to policy that the work of Mid-Victorian colonialist reformers was doomed to fail in India and hardened the racial view of the Indians as incapable of progress; it also was an event that could be read back by Indian nationalists as the first war of independence.<sup>737</sup>

However accurate or not these readings were, the readings, symbolism and representation of the event, whether by contemporaries or retrospective, were as important as, and indeed often inextricable from, the event itself. The story of the Blue Books, as seen in chapter 1, does not end with the report itself – the reactions tell us far more about the link of identity between those with authority to speak as Welsh and the English Commissioners. Also, the links between the Report on the State of education in Wales and the Macaulay Minutes on Education in India are too similar for this Report to be dismissed as merely an extreme case. ‘Colonialism’ should not be used as a catch-all term for all oppression, but neither must it be used to dismiss inequalitarian power relations which criss-cross the globe and which also create resistances to hegemonic power. Such cultural resistances also occurred in India, which was not a passive bloc (or an ‘inert mass’ in Lord Lytton’s phraseology), as described by Partha Chatterjee.<sup>738</sup>

The reactions to these myriad interrelated discourses of education, gender, class, economics, race and so on which underpinned colonialism were therefore similarly complex, and the Welsh position of peripherality at the centre must be analysed critically as resistant and complicit within discourse, often in the same movement. Even as many Welsh were complicit in colonialism and benefited from it, it is important also to make connections between these intranational power relations which were not simply one way but often re-imported. This has been the viewpoint adopted

---

<sup>737</sup> A Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (Routledge: 1998), p 79-80

<sup>738</sup> Lord Lytton cited in T O Ranger, ‘Representing Authority in Victorian India’ in E Hobsbawm & T O Ranger (eds) *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983), p 191; P Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (University of Minnesota Press: 1993); P Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments* (Princeton University Press: 1993)

in this thesis, which indicates how similar discourses and relations were translated into different contexts with different results. There were also counter-hegemonic movements at the centre that the similarly catch-all term of ‘European’ or ‘British oppression’ or ‘Colonial Discourse’ often taken as wholly unproblematic in postcolonial work also misses out upon. This works as a sort of mirror image to Chris Williams’s closing off of discussion by setting up such borders that must not be crossed by theoretical analysis.

The question ‘was Wales colonised?’ is not therefore a particularly useful means of capturing what was ‘occurring’ – the question ‘was Wales in the same colonial (or imperial) position as was India’ is clearly in the negative, but invites us to explore what this different position entailed in particular contexts. To shorthand a sub-continent and its history under the category ‘colonised’ and end the discussion there does not always help us understand how those power relations worked, nor the transnational links at work and how it is also constructed the colonisers’ identity and served to construct models of discipline that were re-imported to be used to civilise groups ‘at home’.

The point of postcolonial theory is to open up discussions of these myriad relations rather than to close them off. In the Welsh context, it is also to analyse particular articulations of Welshness, often resistant, but spoken from a complicit position of authority to speak that identity. It is to not take that identity as a given, which one can then be for or against. Postcolonial theory is thus not divorced from the political and historical realities, but is used to illuminate these relations of power, complicity and resistance at particular sites, as nodal points at which discourses converge and have particular material effects. In terms of identity, this indicates that if we see power coming from everywhere then we do not see subjects as passive, but as being made into subjects within these power relations.

In this situation one cannot have pure identity, as it is always already captured in the same relations of power and within the same discourses – asserting Welsh women’s virtue invoked the same morality as the English commissioners who denigrated it. Asserting Welsh nationality translated the royal ritual of Britain into a Welsh context as part of an ‘Anglo-Celtic Empire’, and then fifty years later some attempted to



decouple this relation. Vital to this position was an attempt to historically decouple Welsh identity from Empire, to show that in this the Welsh were acting under false consciousness, a position which also dismissed complicity in Empire as a 'British' and not 'Welsh' act. Saunders Lewis's construction of a Welsh language literary history as a tradition with moral value for the nation was a view that politicised culture against a sentimentalised consensus of Celtic bunting. That these identities were not pure but translations and rearticulations of identifications does not make them false, or mere copies of an (always-already hybrid) original, but a dynamic response to particular situations which under the terms 'Wales' or 'Welsh' was a means of asserting cultural status and authority to speak for Wales.

It is from these ideas that my postcolonial studies of Welsh identity and power relations in Wales are a contribution to the field. In none of these chapters have I taken Welsh identity to be coherent or as self-complete, nor have I attempted to find a sort of transhistorical Welshness from which we can explain these events within a national identity context. In avoiding these pitfalls it is also required to view power as dynamic, of subjectivity and subjection in flux, and so it cannot merely look at the role of power as repressive, but also as productive of subjects and of resistance. In such a view of discursive power, the emphasis is upon the spaces constructed within discourse and their rearticulations and translations into particular contexts. It is from these positions that specific Welsh articulations of 'Wales' and 'who speaks for Wales' emerge, and have material effects. Each of my chapters attempts to approach the question of Wales from this perspective, indicating different articulations and connections at different times and within different discourses. My aim has not been to claim a new theoretical orthodoxy, nor to claim that other frameworks are not necessary to analyse Welsh identity. I do not have any hostility to placing Wales within theories of nationalism, nor economic history. I do assert, however, that a focus on these particular instances of articulations of Welsh identity can glean important insights by indicating how discursive power constructs spaces for such identities to emerge. There is, surely, a place to think differently on such matters.

The first chapter of this thesis, on the identities that were articulated around the Reports on the State of Education in Wales of 1847, illustrated how Welsh (mainly) nonconformists used their pastoral power as a means of resisting the conclusions of that report. However, it also indicated the complicity of this discourse in asserting that their authority to speak on education matters in Wales was more legitimate. They also shared the Commissioners' moral viewpoint by asserting that Welsh women were not without chastity, and in the same movement increased social policing of that sexuality in order to make this so.

In reconstructing this discourse in the Welsh context they were not merely reacting to a holistic bloc that we can simply name 'English' or 'British colonialism'. Rather, as illustrated by the case of India, British colonialism constructed many of its progressivist ideals of education in India, in the process of constructing Indians as worthy of – and in need of – education constructed 'English Literature' as a pseudo-theological view of 'English civility'. Power relations in India were not merely the imposition of English education as already defined in India, but actively constructed that discourse in the practice of colonialism and educating Indians, which was then re-imported to the centre, and to its peripheries at home. Using Foucault's concept of governmentality I have indicated the dynamism of this activity as not merely led by a thing called 'the state', but as a myriad of operations and practices which materialises viewpoints of man as 'English civility' in educational institutions.

This discourse of 'English education' was therefore itself a hybrid construct, derived from religious and political relations in India. It is the charting of this discourse which allows us to follow the construction of and the emergence of the particular identifications of Welshness, and their material and cultural effects on gender and sexuality, and in feminising the role of Welsh away from the governmental educational apparatus toward the private sphere. Both these effects were interlinked, with gender being the means of reproducing culture and the language.

The second chapter, on the ritual of the Prince's investiture repeated, takes seriously the view that this use of discourse theory is a 'challenge to any rigid demarcation of

event and representation, or history and text.’<sup>739</sup> Again, there are parallels with India, and the chapter illustrates how the process of ritual-making in India to, selectively and from a position of colonial authority, represent the various parts of India also had its parallel development in late-Victorian and Edwardian Britain, and how the ‘bit of bunting’ which was taken to be the particular enthusiasm of the colonials came home to roost at the centre. This ritual allowed for its translation to the Welsh context with the romantic nationalism of Owen Rhoscomyl, a ritual which contemporaries took to have a real and positive national and imperial effect that displaced actual political and social change. This was a displacement that was symptomatic of the Liberal Imperial Wales (and Britain), where sentimental feeling was more important than doing anything – an era of ‘reformers rather than reform.’<sup>740</sup>

The same ‘event’ repeated almost sixty years later illustrates how these identifications had been dismantled and rearticulated, with particular effects. Resistance to the ritual articulated an oppositional Welshness that aimed to disarticulate Wales from ‘Britishness’, a strategically important move that nonetheless carried its own amnesias and rejection of colonial responsibility on the basis of an identity of separation of Welsh from British identity. This movement led also to a view of authentic Welshness that could dismiss some in Wales as living under false consciousness, which was a view that was itself an espousal of authority to speak from a position of essential Welshness. Nonetheless, one can also see the conservatism which could arise from this position in mirroring the investiture ritual in the counter-ritual valorising Welsh princes.

The chapter ends with a return to the theme of education, and an illustration that in this sphere a particular narrative of this event has become the most salient. This is not to say that it is this particular political stance that ‘holds power’ in Wales, nor that it is the only narrative of Welsh speakers, but rather that this educational and cultural sphere has allowed the space for this narrative of this event to have cultural saliency and status. Such an analysis again indicates that one cannot simply view power and discourse as working top-down, but that power comes from everywhere, and that to

---

<sup>739</sup> A Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, p 37

<sup>740</sup> S Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (Princeton: 1969), p 56

understand the workings of these relations is necessary in order also to indicate the dangers that can arise from counter-hegemonic discourses and identities themselves.

The third chapter looked at the role of the Welsh language as a claim to authenticity, looking in particular at Saunders Lewis's mythic history and national narrative. That particular articulation constructed an alternative link of the local and international in opposition to that of Imperial Wales, but also to move from a peaceable Wales with Welsh sentimentalised and kept in the hearth, to a view of culture as politicised; indeed, a greater priority than seeking a nation-state. Analysing this construction as necessarily hybrid indicates these relations of identification, translation and rearticulation, again indicating the dynamism of the cultural developments involved. The contrast of the effects of this resistant and marginal position to that of English Literature, where such views of moral value and tradition became hegemonic and institutionalised, is marked, indicating the different effects of discourses in particular contexts.

A similar view of tradition can be seen in the excavation work by Anglo-Welsh criticism in constructing its own pre-industrial tradition. In doing so it adopted a criterion of judgement similar to that of Lewis, although it challenged views of writing in English as inauthentic. As such, the questions of judging how Welsh was a work gave the critic a similar authority in deciding which art could be defined within Welsh tradition and not, as did a view of tradition which implied the authority of the critic in receiving and channelling that tradition. There were challenges to this viewpoint, in the industrial view of 'truth'. However, recent criticism has questioned the basis on which these linguistic areas and writings were demarcated from each other, as well as questioning the centrality of language as authenticity as such. In decoupling language as a means of demarcating between literatures it has been possible to view the parallels and cross-overs between and beyond them.

In a similar way, there were different poles in pop culture, between the certainty in authenticity of Dafydd Iwan and the revelling in unmeaning and the avant-garde of John Cale. This section indicates a movement from a political message of authenticity to a position where to be in the inbetween, to embrace play and subversion rather than identity and truth, may have political effects. Similarly, a movement away from

language as the signifier of authenticity may serve to allow its linkages with dissonant messages. In this way, this section indicates the link of international pop culture and its relation in, and translation to, a localised culture. Again, the aim is to indicate intracultural transmission, and the incorporation of disparate forms in order to subvert and renew identity. In this way rather than standing in the gap as our authentic selves for ‘truth’, the political act may now be to ask the Super Furry Animals’ question: ‘where-are-you-between?’

#### Problems, Problematisations and Contribution

The criticism will be made that the ‘events’ chosen here for analysis are selective. This is necessarily so and is to some degree at least driven by my own position within Welsh culture, however problematic. I shall come to my own position and background and how they relate to the thesis, which may help the standpoint from which it is written be understood more clearly. However, I would first like to indicate the gaps in the research, or perhaps, what could not be discussed within this methodology and its field of research.

Chris Williams’s view of the need to analyse the histories of minorities and immigrants in Wales is laudable and should certainly be pursued, and an analysis of minorities and ‘race’ is absent here. However, given that the focus of this thesis has been on the hybrid basis of Welsh identities, and the cultural authority from which it has been possible to speak for Wales, this has been beyond the scope of the thesis. The thesis has charted the articulations of particular identities and the basis on which it is possible to gain authority to speak, and race has not generally been at the forefront of the events I have studied. Given that I do not take Welsh identity to be an implicitly holistic form, which is then hybridised in relation to ‘other’ cultures, such an analysis of migration would be even more complicated, and need far wider scope than I could have allowed here.

What I hope the thesis has achieved is interpret the emergence of Welsh identities as not constructing the ‘essential binarisms’ that Chris Williams claims, but were the relations of complex power relations. Doing so indicates spaces to find resonances,

echoes and parallels of other cultures, or the other within the self of Welsh culture, which can be productively linked with the idea that identity is split within itself. Such a viewpoint allows for cultural intratransmission, and also allows us to move away from a view of nationalism which takes internationalism to be its necessary opposite, by indicating the dynamic interplay of spaces and places, identities and translations within this framework of Welsh subjectivities.

In analysing the way in which identity may be resistant and complicit in the same movement, it has been necessary to look at events which may seem fairly conventional in a Welsh nationalist narrative. However, this has been done in order to view these events *differently*, and to link them with the readings and narrations of those events (which cannot be extrapolated from the event itself in this theoretical framework) within wider power relations and networks within which 'Wales' is a node articulating relations of gender, class, morality and so on. In looking at the positions of cultural authority from which it is possible to speak, this has not been a postcolonial work which looks for the subaltern and marginalized histories outside those positions, work which is fruitfully being done in Wales in the literary field by theorists such as Jane Aaron and Kirsti Bohata.<sup>741</sup> This thesis has been about power relations and which articulations of Welshness have been hegemonic at particular points, and their material effects. It has also been about 'worlding' Wales, linking these particular articulations of identity with wider processes of which those particular articulations were an effect.

This approach has meant that this thesis cannot have a clear, coherent and continuous narrative, and as a result the links between chapters is at times inchoate, discontinuous, although there are echoes and overlaps and the concerns are obviously similar. Having dismissed moving from a teleological structure from 'colonial Wales' through to 'imperial Wales' to 'postcolonial Wales' (à la Stephen Knight's work, analysed in the introductory chapter), there was a conscious decision to choose particular events and to allow every chapter to be developed separately in making connections and parallels, which sometimes took surprising turns. There had originally been no plan to discuss Welsh pop for example, but it struck me that there

---

<sup>741</sup> J Aaron, *Pur Fel y Dur*; K Bohata, *Postcolonialism Revisited*

were clear overlaps with the concerns of the chapter about authority, authenticity and language, and that following this trail would take us somewhere other than an analysis of literary criticism(s) alone. The chapter on the Prince's Investitures was originally only to be an analysis of the 1911 at the height of Empire, but a comparison across six decades appeared to tell us more about the basis of disarticulating Welsh identity from British imperialism. This thematic link, rather than a historical narrative has therefore had its advantages as well as disadvantages, the latter of which are clearly that this makes for a certain lack of narrative clarity for the reader. This is not wilful obscurantism. One cannot with consistency have theoretical viewpoints of discontinuity and a teleological narrative in the same work.

Another gap that should be noted is the place of political economy in the thesis. Stuart Hall has noted of recent theory (including postcolonialism) that

What has resulted from the abandonment of this deterministic economism has been, not alternative ways of thinking questions about the economic relations and their effects...but instead a massive, gigantic, *disavowal*. As if, since the economic in its broadest sense, definitively does *not*, as it was once supposed to do, 'determine' the real movement of history 'in the last instance', it does not exist at all.<sup>742</sup>

While I do not deny the importance of economic factors, it is clear that economic relations have been in the background in this thesis. In my defence, however, I would point to the fact that in looking at questions of authority from the perspective I do I would not wish to reduce subject positions to economics. As Foucault writes of his own concerns in relation to economic history:

To put it very simply, psychiatric internment, the mental normalisation of individuals, and penal institutions have no doubt a fairly limited importance if one is only looking for their economic significance. On the other hand, they are undoubtedly essential to the general functioning of the wheels of power. So long as the posing of the question of power was kept subordinate to the economic instance and the system of interest this served, there was a tendency to regard these problems as of small importance.

In a similar way, the concerns of this thesis of power relations in relation to education and governmentality, ritual, literary criticism and language, or the hybrid content of

---

<sup>742</sup> S Hall, 'When was the Postcolonial: Thinking the Limit' from I Chambers & L Curti *The Post-Colonial Question* (Routledge: 1996) p 258

pop music (as opposed to its commercial production), would be of little use to economic-led history. In Marxist parlance, this is clearly a thesis of the superstructure. However, it is clear that ideally a work needs to articulate itself to economic concerns, but the concern has been of reducing things to this ground, or to make a mere sop to economic theory. The concerns of culture and power relations of this thesis lie elsewhere, and the construction of such an economic theory articulated with these concerns is certainly beyond the scope of this thesis, and undoubtedly beyond the scope of my abilities. This is not to deny that my work has a material basis, which I take from the material effects of power relations in Foucauldian theories of power, governmentality and discipline from which I analyse the emergence of identities and authority.

In order to tease out some of the issues that this thesis has raised from my personal concerns, and the way in which I have addressed them, the reader will perhaps indulge me in permitting a return to a story from where this thesis introduced itself, from my home village of Beddgelert. The year is 2003, and I am driving home from Abersytwyth for the summer to finish my MSc(Econ) dissertation in Postcolonial Politics. To my astonishment, in the back of beyond of this North West Wales parish, I passed a farmhouse on which was scrawled the graffiti 'YA BASTA', with a star scrawled next to it. 'Ya Basta!' ('Enough!') is the slogan of the Zapatista rebels in the Chiapas province of southern Mexico, which has subsequently been adopted by the anti-globalisation movement. It was with some hilarity that I found that most people in the village took this to be a grammatically incorrect spelling of personal abuse, 'YA BASTAD' (that is, 'You Bastard'), taking the slightly blurred star to be a 'D'. This is a rather comic example of the translation of wider global ideas into the local, but one which has markedly failed to be (literally and metaphorically) translated into the local context. My parents had found the graffiti quite funny, if perplexing, and became intrigued – although also somewhat more perplexed, as was I - once I had explained where its slogan came from. Perhaps, given my knowledge of the Zapatistas that I undoubtedly revelled in imparting, they thought I was the culprit (a charge – I should make clear in case of legal repercussions - I deny).

Coincidentally, and to explain my expertise in the field of Mexican rebels, the Zapatista rebellion was the subject of my dissertation, which I constructed from the



available written literature on the movement (among other theoretical texts). It was with some trepidation that I visited the Chiapas province the following year as a tourist, afraid that I would find that everything I had written was wrong, that it was the romanticised view of an outsider. It gave me a useful background of understanding for the trip, but it was clear, even as a tourist, from visiting indigenous villages that one missed out much from writing at such a distance. It was for this reason, among others, that I wished to use the theoretical framework I had used to something more concrete and ‘closer to home’ – to attempt to apply postcolonial theory to Wales.

Expecting that writing on something closer to home would be more concrete and that I would be better placed to understand Welsh identity by virtue of having been born in that culture proved simplistic. My expectations were that I had grounding in ‘this’ culture that would prove advantageous. In ‘this’, of course, I was sadly mistaken! Writing from within a culture requires that one question many of one’s basic unacknowledged assumptions. In this way, it is undoubtedly because of my personal concerns regarding my Welsh identity that one can see the choice of ‘events’ used, but it is also in an attempt to question and understand identities that I attempt to view those events from a different perspective.

Whether I have succeeded or not – and indeed, what the parameters for that success or failure are - is for others to decide of course. However, it is clear to me that in the attempt at analysing the emergence of Welsh identity that my own views have been problematised in that process, and that my concern for ‘speaking for Wales’ and the ambivalent authority involved in that act of articulation comes from precisely that questioning of one’s own position. Assuming that I could speak from within the Welsh context misunderstood the contradictions, discontinuities and relational aspects of that identity. This led also to my understanding of representing and speaking for ‘a community’ to be relatively transparent and unproblematic.

While there has been previous work on events analysed in this work, this thesis has a different way of analysing those events in its focus upon spaces which are opened for construction of Welsh identities. In the first chapter, I am indebted to the work of Gwyneth Tyson Roberts on the Blue Books. However, my work focuses more

specifically on the relation between the Blue Books and the discourses of education it reflected, and the spaces it allowed for resistance to their depiction of Wales and the Welsh by some of the Welsh themselves. This resistance had material effects in the construction and defence of the ‘inner culture’ of Wales, its language and in the idealisation of the Welsh mother as the transmitter of Welsh morality. It is the way in which this resistance was also complicit with the Report in sharing many of its assumptions that is central to this chapter, providing a view of power which indicates how this could be done within the colonial discourse of the Blue Books themselves.

Similarly, J R Ellis has written authoritatively on the 1911 investiture, analysing the ritual within the ‘invented tradition’ framework. However, in analysing the event as a ritual upon which meaning is transposed through commentary, and in linking it to a similar ritual in India, it is possible to view the ritual as intertextual. Commentary upon it can be linked to other commentaries elsewhere, and parallels in writing the event can then be made. In opening the ritual to such textual analysis, it is possible to indicate how aberrant and resistant readings could be made of the event, but such readings as those in 1969 could not be done in 1911, owing to changes in the geographical imagination of Welsh nationalism.

Much recent work, drawing in particular on inspiration from M Wynn Thomas has analysed the link between Welsh writing both in Welsh and in English, and focused upon their indebtedness to international literary movements. However, this work focuses upon the construction of the literary disciplines of Welsh Literature and Anglo-Welsh Literature, and their link to general ideas constructed as the discipline of English Literature, and the effect of these parallel developments in marginal positions. In doing so, it also indicates how these disciplines could be constructed as resistant in their effects while drawing upon ideas from the ‘centre’ which had far different effects upon the disciplinary history in Cambridge. This link between the Welsh, ‘Anglo-Welsh’ and international sphere is seen also in its effects on the development of the ‘low culture’ of pop music in Wales. The celebration of the marginal and inbetween gaps of the Super Furry Animals emerges as a postcolonial challenge to Saunders Lewis’ incitement to ‘stand in the gap’.

Overall, this methodology critiques the way in which Said reasserts the identities which he is attempting to subvert by repositing the oppositions of active/passive, powerful/powerless and (for Said) Occident/Orient. Difference emerges not because Wales is in absolute opposition to English (or British, or Empire) but because it is actively constructed within the discourses with which it intersects, and this is done by the Welsh themselves. It is the terms within which these different Welsh identities are constructed at particular times at particular sites which is the focus of this work.

These resistant Welsh identities are constructed differently from within the same conceptual framework as the master discourse itself, and illustrate the possibilities of subverting discourses which cannot be controlled or possessed completely by a central authority, and these identities are complicit at the same time as being a resistance to it. The position of Wales within the imperial centre is a reminder that the centre is not as holistic or as wilful in its discourses as it (and many of its challengers) believes itself to be. This construction of 'Wales' within and in reaction to particular discourses has particular political and cultural effects, and it is these constructions and their effect that this thesis has analysed at particular points and with particular events. As such, this thesis is a contribution to the post-colonial literature more broadly.

### **Return to the Welsh Subject**

It is with all of these difficulties in mind that we can return to the 'death of the (Welsh) subject', analogous to Merfyn Jones' call for Wales to not be a 'cause with adherents'; in effect a movement away from Welsh identity. The concept was a vital contribution by poststructuralist theory in questioning the position of the author, but it is through this very decentring of the subject that the problem of subjectivity returns. As Ernesto Laclau has put it on the decentring of the Cartesian ego:

'History is a process without a subject'. Perhaps. But how do we know it?...If history as a totality is a possible object of experience and discourse, who could be the subject of such an experience but the subject of absolute knowledge? Now if we try to avoid this pitfall, and negate the terrain that would make that assertion a meaningful one, what becomes problematic is the very notion of 'subject position'.

For what could such a position be but a special location within a totality...an absolute subject?<sup>743</sup>

For Laclau, it is the fact that the full Subject is impossible that one can speak of subjectivity and its relation to power and hegemony. It is precisely because full identification is impossible that we can speak of a 'Welsh subject', equivalent but different to other identities, overlapping with them and the result of parallel histories and rearticulations. In this way, one can see that the absolute dispersal of Chris Williams's death of the Welsh subject through the 'postnational' cannot stand as it simply asserts the universal as against Welsh national identity.

We could say, with reference to the contemporary scene, that the dominant tendencies have been polarised around two positions. One of them universally privileges universalism and sees in a dialogical process a way of reaching a consensus transcending all particularism (Habermas); the other, dedicated to the celebration of pure particularism and contextualism, proclaims the death of the universal (as in some forms of postmodernism).<sup>744</sup>

Laclau's answer is that the unbridgeable gap between 'the Subject' and subjectivity (or a full Identity and identification) is precisely that which allows for hegemonic struggle to take place. In this, we can see the link to Foucault and discourse theory and in the construction of resistance to every power relation – it is in the emergence of identities that we can see power relations and the political at work, in articulating that position in relation to other identifications and power relations. It is in this way that one is able to get away from an idea of a grounding in a particular culture without moving to a position of absolute dispersal (which is in fact merely a new universalism). It is necessary to link the particular demands with universal equivalences and wider resonances:

There is no future for the Left if it is unable to create an expansive universal discourse, constructed out of, not against, the proliferation of particularism of the last few decades.<sup>745</sup>

While this thesis is not so ambitious as to construct that universal discourse, it attempts to construct a view of Welsh identity on a basis which is amenable to such a

---

<sup>743</sup> E Laclau, *Emancipation(s)* (Verso: 2007), p 20-1

<sup>744</sup> *ibid*, viii

<sup>745</sup> E Laclau, 'Constructing Universality' in J Butler, E Laclau & S Zizek *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality* (Verso: 2000), p 306

project, and has attempted to frame the local with the global in such a way as to make their interaction a part of processes of identification – there is no particular position or particular culture, no ‘local’ that is not imbued with the global and other trajectories from a multiplicity of points.

So what does this thesis have to say about Welsh identity? On the face of it, nothing, if that is taken to mean the content of ‘a Welsh identity’. Rather, what this thesis attempts to chart is the ways in which particular articulations of Welsh identification emerge in particular circumstances and how these are transformed and rearticulated at different times. This may make this thesis appear parochial. However, the point of each of these particular articulations is that they are not a pure particular identity, and I have attempted genealogically to chart the elements from outside particular attempts at placing a boundary around ‘Wales’ to indicate how these attempts to construct an identity are inevitably hybrid, translations of wider discourses at localised points. In this sense then, this is not a thesis about Welsh identity as such at all; rather, it could be termed a thesis about the processes of identification and their emergence through power relations, with particular reference to Wales. The methodological framework could be utilised elsewhere, undoubtedly illustrating different, if parallel, relations of power.

In moving away from a view of identity as having been or to be filled or fulfilled this thesis therefore frames the question of identification differently. It does not look for a clear boundary or place of identity, but rather at the multiple differential and relational ways in which meaning, and identity, is assigned to particular places and events. The point of viewing particular events and discourses, and articulating them to wider processes, moving from the particular and local to the general in order to indicate the way in which different processes, spaces and memories impact upon those local events is to decentre those events and decentre the idea of identity as such. In genealogically charting the past uses and authority of speaking for Wales, I hope to have indicated the limits of the use of national identity, but also its strategic importance for a cultural criticism that involves a constant immanent critique – what

Raymond Williams has called an ‘anti-nationalist nationalism’, and what Bhabha refers to as ‘envisaging national, anti-nationalist histories of the “people.”’<sup>746</sup>

The case for the importance of questioning ourselves and our own historical construction is made by Foucault:

The critical ontology of ourselves must be considered not, certainly, as a theory, a doctrine, nor even a permanent body of knowledge that is accumulating; it must be conceived as an attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits imposed upon us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them...this task requires work on our limits, that is, a patient labour giving form to our impatience for liberty.<sup>747</sup>

I hope that my thesis is a small contribution to such working on the limits of Welsh identity, with the possibility of going beyond them. In working on ourselves, from the particular to the universal, and the universal in the particular, we may be able to work on the resonances and echoes within other cultures. In articulating a Wales and Welshness as hybrid and linked to other concerns of class, gender, language and so on, it is possible to go beyond identity as something which is defined, is authentic. Going ‘beyond’ is thus not to an eschatological or teleological end point, but emerges from postcolonial critique, through problematising and questioning of the processes and articulations that make us what we think we are. For now.

---

<sup>746</sup> R Williams, ‘Wales and England’, p 24; H K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994) , p 38-9

<sup>747</sup> M Foucault, ‘What is Enlightenment’ in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994) p 319

## **Bibliography**

- Aaron, J. *Nineteenth Century Women's Writing in Wales: Nation, Gender and Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2007)
- Aaron, J. 'Postcolonial Change' in *New Welsh Review* Spring 2005
- Aaron, J. *Pur fel y Dur* (University of Wales Press: 1998)
- Aaron, R. I. 'Ar gyfieithu'r gair "Psychology"', in *Y Llenor*, 8, 1929
- Achebe, C. *The African Writer and the English Language* in P Williams & L Chrisman, *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (Pearson: 1993)
- Achebe, C. *Things Fall Apart* (Penguin Classics: 2001)
- Anderson, B. Balakrishnan, G. *Mapping the Nation* (Verso: 1996)
- Anderson, B. *Imagined Communities* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (Verso: 1991)
- Anderson, P. *English Questions* (Verso: 1992)
- ap Sion, P. "Yn y Fro": Mudiad Adfer and Welsh Popular Song during the 1970s' in *Welsh Music History*, 5 (2002)
- Armitage, D. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge University Press: 2000)
- Arnold, M. *Culture and Anarchy and other Writings* (Cambridge University Press: 1993)
- Arnold, M. *On the Study of Celtic Literature* (Smith, Elder & Co: 1867)
- Ashcroft, B. Griffiths, G. Tiffin, H. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (Routledge: 1994)
- Bacon, A. *Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998)
- Bagehot, W. *The English Constitution* (Sussex Academic Press: 1997)
- Baines, M. Davies, J. Jenkins, M. (eds) *Gwyddoniadur Cymreig* (Academi: 2007)
- Bala, I. 'Horizon Wales: Visual Art and the Postcolonial' in J Aaron and C Williams *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)
- Baldick, C. *The Social Mission of English Criticism 1848-1932* (Oxford: 1983)
- Baring-Gould, S. *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages* (1867, Kessinger: 1998)

- Barker, H. and Taylor, Y. *Faking It: the Quest for Authenticity in Popular Music* (Faber & Faber: 2007)
- Beazley, E. *Madocks and the Wonder of Wales* (Faber & Faber: 1967)
- Bell, C. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford: 1997)
- Benjamin, W. 'Theses on the Philosophy of History', in his *Illuminations* (Pimlico: 1999)
- Benjamin, W. *Illuminations* (Pimlico: 1999)
- Benjamin, W. *The Task of the Translator* in his *Illuminations* (Pimlico: 1999),
- Beriah Evans, G. *Glyndwr: The Investiture Historical Play* (1911)
- Bhabha, H. K. *The Location of Culture* (Routledge: 1994)
- Bhabha, H. K. *Nation and Narration* (Routledge: 1990)
- Bloch, M. *Ritual, History and Power: Selected Papers in Anthropology* (Berg Publishers Ltd: 1989)
- Blumler, J. G. Brown, J. R. Ewbank, A. J. Nossiter, T. J. 'Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their structure and Development during a ceremonial Occasion' in *Political Studies* XIX (1971)
- Bohata, K. *Postcolonialism Revisited: Writing Wales in English* (University of Wales Press: 2004)
- Bohata, K. 'Postcolonialism Revisited' in *New Welsh Review*, Autumn 2005
- Bourdieu, P. 'Systems of Education and Systems of Thought', in F D Young, *Knowledge and Control* (Macmillan: 1971)
- Brooks, S. *O Dan Lygaid y Gestapo: Yr Oleuedigaeth Gymraeg a Theori Lenyddol yng Nghymru* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2004)
- Burchell, G. 'Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and governing 'the system of natural liberty'', in C Gordon, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (University of Chicago: 1993)
- Butler, J. Laclau, E., Zizek, S. *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000)
- Butler, J. *The Psychic Life of Power* (Stanford University Press: 1997)
- Cale, J. Bockris, V, *What's Welsh for Zen?* (Bloomsbury: 1999)
- Cannadine, D. 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c 1820-1977', in Hobsbawm, E, and Ranger, T. O. *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983)



- Caruth, C. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Johns Hopkins: 1996)
- Chakrabarty, D. 'Postcoloniality and the Artifice of history: Who speaks for "Indian" pasts?' In *Representations* 57 (Winter 1992)
- Chambers, I. Curti, L. (eds), *The Post-Colonial Question* (Routledge: 1996)
- Chapman, T. R. *Un Bywyd o Blith Nifer: Cofiant Saunders Lewis* (Gomer: 2006)
- Chatterjee, P. 'Whose Imagined Community?' in Anderson, B, Balakrishnan, G, *Mapping the Nation* (Verso: 1996)
- Chatterjee, P. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (Zed Books: 1993)
- Chatterjee, P. *The Nation and its Fragments* (Princeton University Press: 1993)
- Clement, M. 'Eighteenth Century Charity Schools' in J C Williams and G R Hughes eds, *The History of Education in Wales I* (Christopher Davies: 1978)
- Cohn, B. S. 'Representing Authority in Victorian India' in Hobsbawm, E, Ranger, T. *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983)
- Colley, L. *Britons* (Yale: 1992)
- Collins, J. C. *Review of 'From Shakespeare to Pope'*, in A Bacon (ed), *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998)
- Cymdeithas Anrhydeddus y Cymmrodorion, *Y Bywgraffiadur Cymreig hyd at 1940* (Cymmrodorion: 1953)
- Davies, N. *The Isles* (Macmillan: 1999)
- Davies, P. 'His Criticism' in Jones, A. R. Thomas, G. *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press: 1973)
- Davies, R. *Secret Sins: Sex, Violence and Society in Carmarthenshire 1870-1920* (University of Wales Press: 2004)
- Derfel, R. J. *Brad Y Llyfrau Gleision* (I Clarke: 1854)
- Derrida, J. *Of Grammatology* (Johns Hopkins: 1997)
- Dreyfus, H. L. and Rabinow, P, *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Harvester: 1982)
- Eagleton, T, *Crazy John and the Bishop and Other Essays on Irish Culture* (Cork University Press: 1998)
- Eagleton, T, *Figures of Dissent* (Verso: 2003)

- Eagleton, T. *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Blackwell: 1983)
- Edkins, J. *Poststructuralism and International Relations* (Lynne Reiner: 1999)
- Edward Freeman ‘Literature and Language’ (1887) in A. Bacon (ed), *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998)
- Edwards, D. M. “Meddyleg” ynteu “Eneideg”, in Y Llenor (9), 1930
- Edwards, H. T. *Codi’r Hen Wlad yn ei Hol* (Gomer: 1989)
- Edwards, L. ‘Addysg yng Nghymru’, from *Detholiad o Draethodau Llenyddol Lewis Edwards* (Hughes: 1992)
- Edwards, L. ‘Adroddiad Y Dirprwywyr’ in *Detholiad o Draethodau Llenyddol Lewis Edwards* (Hughes: 1910)
- Eliot, T. S., *The Sacred Wood* (Methuen: 1920)
- Ellis, J. S. ‘Reconciling the Celt: British National Identity, Empire, and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales’ in *Journal of British Studies* 37 (1998)
- Ellis, J. S. ‘The Prince and the Dragon: Welsh National Identity and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales’ in *Welsh History Review* 18 (1996)
- Ellis, J. S. *Nationality, Consensus and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales* (Unpublished PhD Thesis; Aberystwyth)
- Evans, C. *My People* (Seren: 2003)
- Evans, G. *Land of my Fathers* (Lolfa: 1998)
- Evans, R. *Gwynfor Evans: Rhag Pob Brad* Lolfa: 2005)
- Evans, W. G. ‘Y Wladwrieth Brydeinig ac Addysg Gymraeg’ in G. H. Jenkins & M. A. Williams ‘*Eu Hiaith a Gadwant*’: *Y Gymraeg yn yr Ugeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000)
- Evans, W. G. *Female Education and Emancipation: The Welsh Experience* (University of Wales Press: 1990)
- Fanon, F. *Black Skin, White Masks* (Pluto Press: 1986)
- Fanon, F. *The Wretched of the Earth* (Penguin: 1990)
- Faubion, J. D. (ed), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, vol 2: Aesthetics* (Penguin: 1994)
- Faubion, J. D. (ed), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. ‘For an Ethic of Discomfort’ in Faubion, J D (ed), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994)

- Foucault, M. 'Governmentality' in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History' in P Rabinow (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 2: Aesthetics* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. 'Polemics, Politics and Problematisations' in Rabinow, P (ed), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. 'Questions on Geography' in Gordon, C (ed), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (Harvester Press: 1980)
- Foucault, M. 'Security, Territory and Population' in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994),
- Foucault, M. 'The Subject and Power' in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. 'Truth and Power' in J D Faubion *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 3: Power* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. 'What is Enlightenment' in J D Faubion (ed) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994)
- Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Penguin: 1991)
- Foucault, M. *History of Sexuality Vol 1: The Will to Truth* (Penguin: 1998)
- Foucault, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Routledge: 2002)
- Garlick, R. *An Introduction to Anglo-Welsh Literature* (University of Wales Press: 1970)
- Geertz C. *The Interpretation of Culture* (Hutchinson: 1975)
- Gellner, E. *Nations and Nationalism* (Blackwell: 1983)
- Gittins, C. E. *Pioneers of Welsh Education* (University College Swansea: 1964)
- Gordon, C. (ed), Foucault, M, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (Harvester Press: 1980)
- C Gordon (ed) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (University of Chicago: 1991)
- Gordon, C. 'Governmental Rationality: An Introduction' in C Gordon (ed) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (University of Chicago: 1991)
- Griffiths D, Hill, S, *Postcolonial Music in Contemporary Wales: Hybrids and Weird Geographies* in Aaron, J. Williams, C. (eds) *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)

- Griffiths, D, *'Home is living like a man on the run': John Cale's Welsh Atlantic* in *Welsh Music History* (4) 2000
- Grigg, J. *Lloyd George: The People's Champion* (London: 1978)
- Gruffydd, P. *Yr Iaith Gymraeg a'r Dychymyg Daearyddol 1918-1950* in *'Eu Hiaith a Gadwant'?*
- Gruffydd A. Ebenezer, L. *Mae Rhywun yn Gwybod...* (Gwasg Carreg Gwalch)
- Gruffydd, W. J. 'Adolygiad o Braslun o Hanes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg,' *Y Llenor* (11), 1932
- Gruffydd, W. J. 'Adolygiad o Cerdd Dafod', in *Y Llenor* (4) 1925
- Gwent, G. 'Anerchiad i Gymruesau Gymru' in *Y Gymraes*, Jan 1850
- Gwynn, D. *Arwisgiad 1969: Yr Ymateb Gwleidyddol* in *Cof Cenedl XX (Gomer: 2000)*
- Hall, C. 'Histories, Empires and the Postcolonial Moment' in Chambers, I. Curti, L. (eds), *The Post-colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons* (Routledge: 1996)
- Hall, S. 'When was the Postcolonial: Thinking the Limit' from Chambers, I. Curti, L. (eds), *The Post-Colonial Question* (Routledge: 1996)
- Harris, J. 'Rhyfel y Tafodau: Ymatebion Eingl-Gymraeg Cynnar i Ddiwylliant Llenyddol Cymru' in Jenkins, G. H. Williams, M. A. *'Eu Hiaith a Gadwant'?* *Y Gymraeg yn yr Ungeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru)
- Hechter, M. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* (Transactions Publishers: 1999)
- Hobsbawm, E. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: 1990)
- Hobsbawm, E. 'The New Threat to History' in *New York Review*, 1993
- Hobsbawm, E. Ranger, T, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983)
- *Hoff Gerddi Cymru* (Gomer: 2005)
- hooks, b. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism* (Pluto: 1982)
- Hughes, E. *The Prince the Crown and the Cash* (Housmans: 1969)
- Hughes, R. E. *Nid am un Harddwch Iaith: Rhyddiaeth Gwyddoniaeth yn yn Bedwaredd Ganrif ar Bymtheg* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1990)
- Hulme, P. 'Including America' in *Ariel* 26 (1995)

- Hume, I. and Pryce, W. T. R. *The Welsh and their Country* (Gomer: 1986)
- Hunter, I. 'Assembling the School' in A Barry, T Osborne, N Rose, *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (Routledge: 1996)
- Hunter, J. *Soffestri'r Saeson: Hanesyddiaeth a Hunaniaeth yn Oes y Tuduriaid* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000)
- Hynes, S. *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (Oxford: 1968)
- Iwan, D. *Can i Gymru* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 2002)
- Iwan, D. Rhys, M, *Dafydd Iwan* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1981)
- Jameson, F. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Duke University Press: 1992) p xxii
- Jayawardeni, K. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* (Zed Books: 1986)
- Jenkins, R. T. 'Ymyl y Dalen', *Y Llenor* VIII (Oct 1929)
- Jenkins, D. E. *Beddgelert; its facts fairies and folk-lore* (Llewelyn Jenkins: 1899)
- Jenkins, R. T. 'The Development of Nationalism in Wales', in *The Sociological Review XXVII, vol 2* (1935)
- Jenkins, R. T. *Yr Apel at Hanes* (Hughes a'i fab: 1930)
- Jones, D. G. 'His Politics' in A. R. Jones & G. Thomas (eds), *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press: 1973)
- Jones, E. (Ieuan Gwynedd), *A vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales; in reply to W Wms Llandovery* (William Rees: 1848)
- Jones, E. (Ieuan Gwynedd), *Facts, Figures and Statements in Illustration of the Dissent and Morality of Wales* (B L Green: 1849)
- Jones, F. P. 'The Blue Books of 1847' in J C Williams and G R Hughes, *The History of Education in Wales I* (Christopher Davies: 1978)
- Jones, F. *Official Investiture Programme* (Liverpool: 1969)
- Jones, F. *The Prince and Principalities of Wales* (University of Wales Press: 1969)
- Jones, G. E. Roderick, G. W. *A History of Education in Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2003),
- Jones, G. S. *Languages of Class* (Cambridge: 1983)
- Jones, G. *The Dragon has Two Tongues* (J M Dent & Sons Ltd: 1968)

- Jones, I. G. *Mid-Victorian Wales: The Observers and the Observed* (University of Wales Press: 1992)
- Jones, J. R. *Gwaedd yng Nghyrmu* (Wasg y Dderwen: 1970)
- Jones, J. R. *Prydeindod* (Llyfrau Dryw: 1966)
- Jones, R. M. 'Beyond Identity? The Construction of the Welsh', *Journal of British Studies*, 31 (1992)
- Kierkegaard, S. *The Sickness Unto Death* (Penguin: 1984)
- Knight, S. *A Hundred Years of Fiction* (University of Wales Press: 2004)
- Kuhn, W. M. *Democratic Royalism* (Macmillan: 1996)
- Laclau, E. 'Constructing Universality' in Butler, J, Laclau, E, Zizek, S, *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000)
- Laclau, E. 'Identity and Hegemony', from Butler, J. Laclau, E. Zizek, S. *Contemporary, Hegemony, Contingency: Contemporary dialogues on the Left* (Verso: 2000)
- Laclau, E. *Emancipation(s)* (Verso: 2007)
- Laird, M. A. *Missionaries and Education in Bengal 1793-1837* (Oxford University Press: 1972)
- Lant, J. L. *Insubstantial Ceremony* (H Hamilton: 1979)
- Leavis, F. R. 'Literary Criticism and Philosophy: a Reply' in *Scrutiny* 6, no 1 (1937)
- Leavis, F. R. *For Continuity* (Cambridge University Press: 1933)
- Leavis, Q. D. *Fiction and the Reading Public* (Chatto & Windus: 1939)
- Levi-Strauss, C. *Structural Anthropology* (Basic Books: 1977)
- Levi-Strauss, C. *The Savage Mind* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson: 1966)
- Lewis, G. 'Bryn Terfel' in Herbert, and Stead, P (eds) *Hymns and Arias: Great Welsh Voices* (University of Wales Press: 2001)
- Lewis, S. 'Dafydd Nanmor' in *Y Llenor* (Oct 1925)
- Lewis, S. 'Forever Oscar' (1962), in H Pritchard Jones (ed) *Saunders Lewis: A Presentation of His Work* (Templegate Publishers: 1990)
- Lewis, S. 'Letter on Catholicism' (1927), in Harri Pritchard Jones *Saunders Lewis: a Presentation of his Work* (Templegate: 1990)
- Lewis, S. 'The Deluge', in A R Jones and G Thomas (eds) *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (University of Wales Press)

- Lewis, S. 'The Fate of the Language', in Jones, A. R. Thoms, G. *Presenting Saunders Lewis* (Gwasg prifysgol Cymru: 1973)
- Lewis, S. *Braslun o Hnaes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg, cyf 1: hyd at 1535* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1932)
- Lewis, S. *Buchedd Garmon* (Gomer: 1957)
- Lewis, S. *Canlyn Arthur* (Gomer: 1938)
- Lewis, S. *Is there an Anglo-Welsh Literature?* (University of Wales Press: 1939)
- Lewis, S. *Principles of Nationalism* (Plaid Cymru: 1975)
- Lewis, S. *Williams Pantycelyn* (Foyle's Welsh Depot: 1927)
- Lloyd Owen, G. *Cerddi'r Cywilydd* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1972)
- Lloyd, D. *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-colonial Moment* (Duke Press: 1993)
- Lloyd-Morgan, C. 'From Temperance to Suffrage' in Angela V John *Our Mothers' Land: chapters in Welsh women's history 1830-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1991)
- Llywelyn, E. 'What is Adfer?' in I. Hume and W. T. R. Pryce *The Welsh and their Country* (Gomer: 1986)
- Loomba, A. 'Overworlding the Third World' in Williams, P. Chrisman, L. (eds), *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory* (Longman: 1993)
- Loomba, A. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (Routledge: 1998)
- Lukes, S. *Essays in Social Theory* (Macmillan: 1977)
- Macaulay, T. B. 'Minutes on Indian Education', in G M Young (ed) *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952)
- Macaulay, T. B. 'Speech on Education' in G M Young (ed), *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952)
- Macaulay, T. B. 'Speech on Government in India', in G M Young (ed) *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry* (Rupert Hart-Davis: 1952)
- Macaulay, T B, *Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England* (1826) in A Bacon, A, *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998)
- Marx, K, 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in McLellan D, *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (Oxford University Press: 2000)
- Mathias, R, *A Ride Through the Wood* (Poetry Wales Press: 1985)

- Mathias, R. *Anglo-Welsh Literature: An Illustrated History* (Poetry Wales Press: 1987)
- McGuinness, P. Letter in *New Welsh Review*, Spring 2005
- McLellan D. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (Oxford University Press: 2000)
- Miles, G. 'A Personal View', in A R Jones & G Thomas,
- Mill, J. *The History of British India* (Chicago: 1975)
- Morgan, K. O. *Rebirth of a Nation* (Oxford: 1998)
- Morgan, P. 'From a Death to a View: The Hunt for the Welsh Past in the Romantic Past' in Hobsbawm, E, Ranger, T, *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983)
- Morris, J. *Farewell The Trumpets* (Faber: 1978)
- Mufti, A. 'Global Comparativism' in *Critical Inquiry* (Winter 2005)
- Mwyn, R. *Can o'r Tywyllwch: Hunangofiant Rhys Mwyn* (Lolfa: 2006)
- Nairn, T. *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy* (Vintage: 1994)
- O'Tuathail, G. *Critical Geopolitics* (University of Minnesota Press: 1996)
- Palmer, D. J. *The Rise of English Studies* (Oxford: 1965)
- Panikkar, K. M. *Culture, Ideology, Hegemony* (Anthem:1995)
- Parekh, B. 'Liberalism and Colonialism: a critique of Locke and Mill' in B Parekh and J. N. Pieterse (eds), *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge, Power* (University of Chicago Press: 1999)
- Parry, T. *Hanes Llenyddiaeth hyd 1900* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 1953)
- Phillips, D. *Hanes Cymdeithas yr Iaith 1962-1998* in Jenkins, G H, Williams, M A (eds), *'Eu Hiaith a Gadwant'?: Y Gymraeg yn yr Ugeinfed Ganrif* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2000)
- Phillips, R. *Island Stories and Border Crossings: School History and the Discursive Creation of National Identity* in Aaron, J. Williams, C. *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)
- Pikoulis, J. 'The Ideology of 'Anglo-Welsh'', in *Planet 74* (April 1989)
- Porter, D. 'Orientalism and its Problems' in Williams, P. Chrisman, L. (eds) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory* (Longman: 1993)
- Price, S. *Everything (a book about the Manic Street Preachers)* (Virgin Books: 1999)



- Procacci, G. 'Social Economy and the Government of Poverty' in C Gordon (ed), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: 1991)
- Prochaska, F. *The Republic of Britain 1760-2000* (Allen Lane: 2000)
- Rabinow, P. (ed), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984 vol 1: Ethics* (Penguin: 1994)
- Ranger, T. O. 'Representing Authority in Victorian India' in E Hobsbawm & T O Ranger (eds) *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge University Press: 1983)
- Rees, W. J. 'Inequalities: Caradoc Evans and D. J. Williams' in *Planet* 81
- Renan, E. *What is the Nation?* in Bhabha, H K (ed), *Nation and Narration* (Blackwell: 1990)
- Rhoscomyl, O. M. *Flame-Bearers of Welsh History* (Merthyr Tydfil: 1905)
- Rhys, G. 'Preface' to Rhys Mwyn, *Can o'r Tywyllwch: Hunangofiant Rhys Mwyn* (Lolfa: 2006)
- Rhys, J. *Lectures in Welsh Philology* (Trubner & Co: 1877)
- Richards, I. A. *Practical Criticism* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: 1929)
- Richardson, A. *Literature, Education and Romanticism* (Cambridge: 1994)
- Roberts, G. T. *The Language of the Blue Books: The Perfect Instrument of Empire* (University of Wales Press: 1998)
- Roberts, K. 'Atgofion am Syr John Morris-Jones', Barn 22, August 1964
- Rorty, R. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (Cambridge University Press: 1989)
- Rousseau, J. J. *Emile* (Heinemann: 1975)
- Said, E. W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (Penguin: 1995)
- Sampson, G. *English for the English* (Cambridge University Press: 1921)
- Shils, E. Young, M. *The Meaning of the Coronation* in *The Sociological Review* I (1953)
- Smith, D. Letter in *New Welsh Review*, Summer 2005
- Smith, D. *Psycho-Colonialism* in *New Welsh Review* Winter 2005
- Smith, D. *Wales: A Question For History* (Seren: 1999)
- Snow, C. P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge University Press: 1962)
- Staal, F. *The Meaninglessness of Ritual* in *Numen* 33, no 2 (1968)
- Stevens C. *Welsh Courting Customs* (Gomer: 1993)

- Stevens M. Ebenezer, L. *I Adrodd yr Hanes: 51 o ganeuon Meic Stevens* (Gwasg Carreg Gwalch: 1993)
- Stevens, M. *Hunangofiant y Brawd Houdini* (Lolfa: 2003)
- Stokes, E. *The English Utilitarians in India* (OUP India: 1989)
- Stone, L. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson: 1977)
- *The Newbolt Report on the teaching of English in England* (1921) in A. Bacon (ed) *The Nineteenth Century History of English Studies* (Ashgate: 1998)
- Thiong'o, N wa, 'On the Abolition of the English Department' in B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (eds) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (Routledge: 1995)
- Thiong'o, N wa, *The Language of African Literature*, in Williams , Chrisman, L. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (Pearson: 1993)
- Thomas, N. *Derek Walcott: Poet of the Islands* (University of Wales Press: 1980)
- Thomas, N. *The Welsh Extremist* (Y Lolfa: 1991)
- Tudur, G. *Wyt ti'n Cofio?* (Lolfa: 1989)
- Urry, J. *Consuming Places* (Routledge: 1995)
- Viswanathan, G. *Masks of Conquest* (Oxford University Press: 1989)
- Wigley, D. *Dal Ati* (Gwasg Gwynedd: 1993)
- Williams , R. 'Remaking Welsh History' in D. G. Williams *Who Speaks for Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, C. 'Problematizing Wales: An Essay in Historiography and Postcoloniality' in J. Aaron and C. Williams, *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)
- Williams, C. 'Problematizing Wales: An Exploration in Historiography and Postcoloniality' in C. Williams & J. Aaron *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)
- Williams, D. G. (ed), Williams, R. *Who Speaks for Wales: Nation, Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, D. G. 'Back to a National Future?' In *Planet: The Welsh Internationalist*, Summer 2006

- Williams, D. G. 'Introduction: The Return of the Native' in Williams, D. G. (ed), Williams, R. *Who Speaks for Wales: Nation, Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, D. J. *Hen Dy Ffarm* (Aberystwyth: 1963)
- Williams, G. A. *When Was Wales?* (Penguin: 1985)
- Williams, J. G. *The University College of North Wales: Foundations* (University of Wales Press): 1985)
- Williams, J. G. *The University of Wales 1893-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1996)
- Williams, J. (Ysgafell), *Artegall : or, Remarks on the Reports of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of Education in Wales* (Longman: 1848)
- Williams, P. Chrisman, L. (eds) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory* (Longman: 1993)
- Williams, R. 'The Arts in Wales' in D G Williams (ed), *Who Speaks for Wales? Nation, Culture, Identity* (University of Wales Press, 2003)
- R Williams, 'Community' in D G Williams *Who Speaks for Wales?* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, R. 'Wales and England' in Williams, D G (ed), Williams, R, *Who Speaks for Wales: Nation, Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, R. 'Welsh Culture' in Williams, D G (ed), Williams, R, *Who Speaks for Wales: Nation, Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, R. 'Who Speaks for Wales' in Daniel Williams (ed) *Who Speaks For Wales? Nation Culture Identity* (University of Wales Press: 2003)
- Williams, R. *Keywords* (Fontana: 1976)
- Williams, S. R. 'Brad y Tir Du' in Prys Morgan (ed) *Brad y Llyfrau Gleision* (Gomer: 1991)
- Williams, S. R. 'The True "Cymraes": Images of Women in Women's Nineteenth Century Welsh Periodicals' in A V John (ed) *Our Mothers' Land: Chapters in Welsh Women's History 1830-1939* (University of Wales Press: 1991)
- Williams, W. *Speech on education in Wales, Tuesday March 10 1846* (George Woodfal and Son: 1846)

- Windsor, E. *A King's Story: the Memoirs of HRH the Duke of Windsor* (G P Putnam: 1951)
- Wyn Jones, R. 'In the Shadow of the First Born: The Colonial Legacy in Welsh Politics' in *Postcolonial Wales* (University of Wales Press: 2005)
- Wyn Jones, R. *Rhoi Cymru'n Gyntaf: Syniadaeth Plaid Cymru* (Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru: 2007)
- Wyn, H. *Be-Bop-a-Lula'r Delyn Aur* (Lolfa: 2002)
- Wyn, H. *Blerwyttirhwng?: Hanes Canu Poblogaidd Cymraeg 1980-2000* (Lolfa: 2006)
- Wynn Thomas, M. *Corresponding Cultures: The Two Literatures of Wales* (University of Wales Press: 1999)
- Yeats, W. B. *Selected Poems* (Penguin Modern Classes: 2000)
- Young, R. J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (Routledge: 1994)
- Yuval-Davis, N. Anthias, F. *Woman-Nation-State* (St Martin's Press: 1989)
  
- *Newspapers, Supplements and Programmes*
- *Baner ac Amserau Cymru,*
- *Barn*
- *Ceremonial to be Observed at the Investiture of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales* (Harrison & Sons: 1911)
- *Chester Chronicle: investiture edition* (1969)
- *Cymru am Byth: Programme of the Investiture of the Prince of Wales* (Arvon Printing & Stationery: 1911)
- *I Serve: 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Investiture of the Prince of Wales* (Atalink Ltd: 1994)
- *Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury*
- *Manchester Guardian*
- *North Wales Chronicle: Investiture Supplement* (1969)
- *Souvenir of the Investiture of H R H Prince of Wales, Carnarvon Castle July 13th 1911* (Valentine & Sons Ltd, Dundee, London and Montreal)
- *The Book of the Investiture* (The Educational Publishing Co: 1911)

- *The Guardian*
- *The Investiture of HRH the Prince of Wales: Handbook and Official Programme of Festivities* (Liverpool Courter: 1911)
- *Wales and her Prince: The Investiture and all About it* (Daily News: 1911)
- *Western Mail*
- *Woman's Own, Investiture Supplement* (1969)
- *Young Wales*

- **Music and Film**

- Edward H Dafis, *Sneb yn Becso Dam* (Sain: 1976)
- Gorky's Zygotic Mynki, 'Patio Song', on *Barafundle* (Fontana: 1997)
- Manic Street Preachers, 'A Design For Life' on *Everything Must Go* (Sony Music Entertainment: 1996)
- Manic Street Preachers, 'PCP' on *The Holy Bible* (Sony Music Entertainment: 1996)
- Super Furry Animals *Mwng* (Placid Casual: 2000), translation at [www.Mwng.co.uk](http://www.Mwng.co.uk)